

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 201--32nd Congress

Chapter 554--1st Session

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Digest of Public Law 201	1
Index and Summary of S. 622	2

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 201

AN ACT: Providing permanent increase in basic compensation for all employees whose rates of compensation are fixed by the Classification Act of 1949, as well as increases for other employees in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government.

Amendments Agreed to:

By a vote of 118 to 117; Representative Rhodes' amendment to strike out the section of the bill requiring non-defense agencies to absorb the cost of the pay increases during the fiscal year 1952.

By Senator McMahon, to make the increase applicable to the Foreign Service, as amended by an amendment submitted by Senator Johnston.

By Senator Langer, to make increase retroactive to July 1, 1951.

By Senator Underwood, to raise the pay ceiling for employees of the Central Bank for Cooperatives, production credit corporations, production credit associations and banks for cooperatives to \$13,800 per annum so as to grant the \$800 increase for such employees in the top brackets.

By Senator Langer, as modified by an amendment in the nature of a substitute by Senator Mounsey, to provide for an increase of 10% for the classified employees, with a maximum of \$800.

The bill increases the pay of classified workers by 10% with a minimum of \$300 and a maximum of \$800, retroactive to the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951.

Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid under this Act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid a retired officer or employee for services rendered during the period beginning with the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951, and ending with the date of his retirement.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF S. 622

January 22, 1951	Senator Johnston introduced S. 622 which was referred to Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Print of bill as introduced.
July 20, 1951	Senate Committee reported S. 622 with amendments. Senate Report 560. Print of bill as reported.
September 14, 1951	Senate began debate on S. 622.
September 17, 1951	Senate concluded debate on S. 622. S. 622 passed the Senate with amendments.
September 20, 1951	Passed House with language of H. R. 339 inserted as an amendment in the nature of a substitute.
September 21, 1951	Senate conferees appointed
September 25, 1951	House conferees appointed
October 18, 1951	House received conference report
October 19, 1951	Both Houses agreed to Conference Report
October 24, 1951	Approved: Public Law 201

January 22, 1951	Senator Johnston introduced S. 652 which was referred to Committee on Labor and Civil Service. Title of bill as introduced.
July 20, 1951	Senate Committee reported S. 652 with amendments. Title of bill as reported.
September 14, 1951	Senate passed S. 652.
September 17, 1951	Senate confirmed debate on S. 652.
September 20, 1951	S. 652 passed and Senate with amendments. Passed House with language T. H. R. 75 inserted as an amendment in the House of Representatives.
September 21, 1951	Senate confirmed amendments.
September 22, 1951	House confirmed amendments.
October 18, 1951	House received conference report.
October 19, 1951	House passed House of Representatives report.
October 24, 1951	Approved: Title: Law 751

Please return to
CHIEF, LEGISLATIVE REPORTING
Office of Budget and Finance

82^d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 622

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 22 (legislative day, JANUARY 8), 1951

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. ECTON) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

A BILL

To increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That all the basic rates of compensation provided in title
4 VI of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, are hereby
5 increased by 17 per centum: *Provided*, That the 17 per
6 centum authorized herein shall be payable only on that part
7 of an employee's compensation not in excess of \$5,000 per
8 annum or hourly equivalent thereof.

9 SEC. 2. The increases in basic rates of compensation pro-
10 vided in this Act shall not be construed to be an equivalent

1 increase in compensation within the meaning of section 701
2 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

3 SEC. 3. The increases in basic rates of compensation pro-
4 vided in this Act shall apply to the basic compensation rates
5 of positions established under another pay and classification
6 system in which the incumbents have been transferred to
7 coverage under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

8 SEC. 4. This Act shall become effective upon the first
9 day of the first pay period which begins after enactment.

A BILL

A BILL

To increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr.
LANGER, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. ECTON

JANUARY 22 (legislative day, JANUARY 8), 1951
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Post
Office and Civil Service

PAY INCREASES FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

JULY 20 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1951—Ordered to be printed

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 622]

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to which was referred the bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon, with amendments, and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

GENERAL STATEMENT

S. 622 proposes, among other things, an upward revision of the pay schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. This is the principal pay statute affecting the salaries of about a million employees outside of the postal service, roughly about 42 percent of all employees in the executive branch. For the most part these employees are engaged in administrative, professional, scientific, and office and clerical work. They are commonly referred to as white-collar groups. About 80 percent of the employees under the Classification Act of 1949 work outside of Washington and about 20 percent work in the Washington area.

The bill makes adequate provision to assure that every employee paid under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, will receive an increase in compensation through the initial adjustment to the new schedules.

BACKGROUND OF CLASSIFICATION ACT PAY INCREASES

With the exception of a minor change in some of the very lowest grades there were no increases in rates of pay under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, between 1930 and 1945. In fact, for part of this period, there were decreases.

Since 1945, there have been four changes in the basic pay schedules of the Classification Act:

1. On July 1, 1945, the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 increased the rates of basic compensation by a sliding percentage scale ranging from 20 percent at the floor to 8.9 percent at the ceiling. The average increase was 15.9 percent.

2. On July 1, 1946, the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 increased rates almost uniformly by 14 percent, subject, however, to a \$10,000 ceiling. The effect was an increase of about 25 percent at the floor and 2 percent at the ceiling. The average increase was 14.2 percent.

3. On July 11, 1948, the postal rate revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 increased all salaries by \$330. The effect was that of a sliding scale ranging from 30.6 percent at the very bottom to 3.3 percent at the ceiling. The average increase was 11 percent.

4. On October 30, 1949, the Classification Act of 1949 increased rates of basic compensation by about 4.1 percent. It reversed to some extent the prior trend toward disproportionately low increases in the middle and higher brackets principally by establishing three new grades at the top of the general schedule, GS-16, \$11,200-\$12,000; GS-17, \$12,200-\$13,000; and GS-18, \$14,000. The act, however, limited the number of positions that could exist in any of these grades at any one time to 300 in GS-16, 75 in GS-17, and 25 in GS-18.

BASIS FOR CLASSIFICATION ACT PAY INCREASES

In recommending the pay increases provided by S. 622, the committee has taken into consideration the increase in the cost of living, the national salary and wage stabilization policy, the increased cost, and the necessity of avoiding a distortion of job values as set forth in the grades of the Classification Act.

There have been no revisions of Classification Act pay scales since enactment of the Classification Act of 1949, approved October 28, 1949.

The increase in the cost of living since that date is well known. It has had an adverse effect upon the various white-collar groups of Federal employees. Whereas blue-collar employees paid on the basis of local prevailing wages have received pay increases, that has not been true of the groups covered by this bill. The National Consumers' Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics increased 8.8 percent, from 169.7 (revised index) in October 1949 to 184.6 (revised index) in April 1951. Using this figure, and thus keeping within the general limitations of national economic policy, the committee proposes an 8.8 percent increase in entrance salaries of the grades of the Classification Act of 1949, and a revision of Classification Act pay schedules on that basis.

National economic policy permits general increases of 10 percent in wage and salary levels subsequent to January 15, 1950. At the present time the Federal Government is engaged in economic control activities to prevent inflation and it is our view that pay increases in the Federal service should be well within such limits. Any action taken to benefit Government employees which is inconsistent with national policy for private industry would inevitably, and with good reason, be regarded by private employers as a general precedent.

The bill provides an across-the-board percentage Classification Act increase rather than a uniform dollar increase or a sliding scale.

Because of sliding scale and uniform dollar increases enacted by Congress in the past, there have been disproportionately smaller increases in the middle and higher brackets than in the lower grades. For example, between 1939 and 1949 the entrance salaries of grades GS-1 to GS-6 of the general schedule were increased as much as 75 percent and at least 50 percent while the entrance salaries of the higher grades from GS-7 to GS-15 were increased at most 47 percent, and as little as 25 percent. Similarly, in the same period, the entrance salary of grade CPC-2 in the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule was increased 96 percent while that of CPC-10, the highest grade in that schedule, was increased 60 percent.

With the exception of the Classification Act of 1949, every other pay adjustment since 1945 has compressed or narrowed the pay schedules between floor and ceiling, that is, between the lowest and highest pay rates for adult employees. This is shown in the table below:

Changes in the ratio of the ceiling rate to the adult floor rate of the Classification Act, 1924-49

Date	Ceiling	Adult floor	Ratio of ceiling rate to adult floor rate
July 1, 1924.....	\$7,500.00	\$900.00	8.33
July 1, 1928.....	9,000.00	1,020.00	8.82
Aug. 1, 1942.....	9,000.00	1,200.00	7.50
July 1, 1945.....	9,800.00	1,440.00	6.81
July 1, 1946.....	10,000.00	1,690.00	5.92
July 11, 1948.....	10,330.00	2,020.00	5.11
Oct. 30, 1949.....	14,000.00	2,120.00	6.60
S. 622.....	14,788.80	2,308.80	6.41

In 1924, the Government's policy was to pay top executives and scientists under the Classification Act eight and one-third times more than the work of an office laborer or cleaner. By compressing the pay scales into a narrower compass in the intervening years between 1924 and 1948, the Government's policy in 1948 was to pay top executives or scientists only about five times more than that of an office laborer or cleaner. Congress improved this condition to some extent when it revised the Classification Act in 1949. The effect of the bill will be to maintain, approximately, the existing ratio between the ceiling of the Classification Act and the minimum rate of CPC-2.

The Congress revised the pay schedules of the Classification Act in 1949 by adjusting this and other inconsistencies that had crept into the schedules through the practice of granting proportionately larger increases in the lower grades. As the schedules stand now, pay relationships among the grades are materially improved compared to those which existed in previous years. S. 622 would continue this trend. The committee is of the opinion that Congress should not now distort these relationships and return to the backward trend of the pay adjustments which between 1945 and 1948 gave rise in fact to the need for the action Congress took less than 2 years ago in comprehensively revising the Classification Act.

Positions under the Classification Act are placed in classes and grades according to the level of their duties and responsibilities and the qualifications required to do the work. The relationships of job values thus established form a sound basis for good personnel admin-

istration and good management in general. These relationships between job levels must be recognized by corresponding differences in compensation levels. Flat dollar increases do not do this. They compress the pay schedules to a point where job values are distorted. The practical effect is to increase the relative value of simpler, less difficult and less responsible jobs and decrease the relative value of the more complex, difficult, and responsible jobs. In a career service, the result is to offer less incentive to the more capable employees to assume more responsible positions in the service, or even to remain in a service which is unwilling to recognize in a substantive manner the differences in job requirements.

The committee believes that the desirability of granting to present employees a pay increase which recognizes the increased cost of living should not obscure the fact that the proposed schedules will be used in the future for recruitment, promotions, and demotions. The problem is not merely to increase employees' incomes. It involves also the necessity of doing this through pay schedules that can be operated to the advantage of the service, that will have logic in fact and thus help the Government to maintain its competitive position as an employer in the labor market.

CONSTRUCTION AND EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED CLASSIFICATION ACT PAY SCHEDULES

The new pay schedules for the Classification Act of 1949 as proposed in section 1 of the bill provide an over-all average increase of 8.4 percent. Salary increases are limited to \$800 per annum. Subject to this limitation the existing entranee (minimum) salary rate of each grade is increased by approximately 8.8 percent and each rate thereafter by a uniform step-increase for the grade.

With the exception of GS-17, the increases in the entranee rates of GS-15, 16, 17, and 18 are somewhat less than \$800 and are 7.95, 7.0, 6.6, and 5.6 percent, respectively, for each grade.

The Comptroller General has recommended that all Classification Act rates should be evenly divisible by 2,080, the number of hours in a basic or straight-time work year, in order to remove uncertainties and ambiguities in payroll computations and to simplify the task of his office in preparing and applying Government salary tables.

The pay schedules have been so constructed. All step-increases are adjusted to be divisible by 2,080. The present step-increase of \$60 is changed to \$62.40; \$70 and \$80 step-increases to \$83.20; \$100 to \$104; \$125 to \$124.80; \$200 to \$208; and \$250 to \$249.60. A few changes in step-increases are made in the higher grades in order to keep the amount of increase within the \$800 limitation. The number of step-increases is the same for each grade as in existing legislation.

The proposed annual pay rates for the general schedule range from \$2,392, the entranee rate of GS-1, to \$14,788.80, the single rate of GS-18. The entrance rate for grade CPC-1 (boy and girl messengers) of the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule as proposed is \$1,643.20; for grade CPC-2, the lowest grade for adults, it is \$2,308.80; and for grade CPC-10, the top grade of that schedule, the new entranee rate is \$4,513.60. The greatest individual increase is \$800 and the smallest increase is \$133.20 (CPC-1). For an adult worker, the smallest increase is \$188.80. The average increase is \$307.53.

The present and proposed pay scales and the amount of increase for each grade of the general schedule and the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule are shown in tables 1 and 2 below.

TABLE 1.—*Proposed pay scales of the general schedule*¹

Grade	Per annum rates within grade						
1.....	\$2,392.00	\$2,475.20	\$2,558.40	\$2,641.60	\$2,724.80	\$2,808.00	\$2,891.20
	2,200.00	2,280.00	2,360.00	2,440.00	2,520.00	2,600.00	2,680.00
	192.00	195.20	198.40	201.60	204.80	208.00	211.20
2.....	\$2,662.40	\$2,745.60	\$2,828.80	\$2,912.00	\$2,995.20	\$3,078.40	\$3,161.60
	2,450.00	2,530.00	2,610.00	2,690.00	2,770.00	2,850.00	2,930.00
	212.40	215.60	218.80	222.00	225.20	228.40	231.60
3.....	\$2,891.20	\$2,974.40	\$3,057.60	\$3,140.80	\$3,224.00	\$3,307.20	\$3,390.40
	2,650.00	2,730.00	2,810.00	2,890.00	2,970.00	3,050.00	3,130.00
	241.20	244.40	247.60	250.80	254.00	257.20	260.40
4.....	\$3,120.00	\$3,203.20	\$3,286.40	\$3,369.60	\$3,452.80	\$3,536.00	\$3,619.20
	2,875.00	2,955.00	3,035.00	3,115.00	3,195.00	3,275.00	3,355.00
	245.00	248.20	251.40	254.60	257.80	261.00	264.20
5.....	\$3,369.60	\$3,494.40	\$3,619.20	\$3,744.00	\$3,868.80	\$3,993.60	\$4,118.40
	3,100.00	3,225.00	3,350.00	3,475.00	3,600.00	3,725.00	3,850.00
	269.60	269.40	269.20	269.00	268.80	268.60	268.40
6.....	\$3,764.80	\$3,889.60	\$4,014.40	\$4,139.20	\$4,264.00	\$4,388.80	\$4,513.60
	3,450.00	3,575.00	3,700.00	3,825.00	3,950.00	4,075.00	4,200.00
	314.80	314.60	314.40	314.20	314.00	313.80	313.60
7.....	\$4,160.00	\$4,284.80	\$4,409.60	\$4,534.40	\$4,659.20	\$4,784.00	\$4,908.80
	3,825.00	3,950.00	4,075.00	4,200.00	4,325.00	4,450.00	4,575.00
	335.00	334.80	334.60	334.40	334.20	334.00	333.80
8.....	\$4,576.00	\$4,700.80	\$4,825.60	\$4,950.40	\$5,075.20	\$5,200.00	\$5,324.80
	4,200.00	4,325.00	4,450.00	4,575.00	4,700.00	4,825.00	4,950.00
	376.00	375.80	375.60	375.40	375.20	375.00	374.80
9.....	\$5,012.80	\$5,137.60	\$5,262.40	\$5,387.20	\$5,512.00	\$5,636.80	\$5,761.60
	4,600.00	4,725.00	4,850.00	4,975.00	5,100.00	5,225.00	5,350.00
	412.80	412.60	412.40	412.20	412.00	411.80	411.60
10.....	\$5,449.60	\$5,574.40	\$5,699.20	\$5,824.00	\$5,948.80	\$6,073.60	\$6,198.40
	5,000.00	5,125.00	5,250.00	5,375.00	5,500.00	5,625.00	5,750.00
	449.60	449.40	449.20	449.00	448.80	448.60	448.40
11.....	\$5,886.40	\$6,094.40	\$6,302.40	\$6,510.40	\$6,718.40	\$6,926.40	\$7,134.40
	5,400.00	5,600.00	5,800.00	6,000.00	6,200.00	6,400.00	6,600.00
	486.40	494.40	502.40	510.40	518.40	526.40	534.40
12.....	\$6,968.00	\$7,176.00	\$7,384.00	\$7,592.00	\$7,800.00	\$8,008.00	\$8,216.00
	6,400.00	6,600.00	6,800.00	7,000.00	7,200.00	7,400.00	7,600.00
	568.00	576.00	584.00	592.00	600.00	608.00	616.00
13.....	\$8,278.40	\$8,486.40	\$8,694.40	\$8,902.40	\$9,110.40	\$9,318.40	\$9,526.40
	7,600.00	7,800.00	8,000.00	8,200.00	8,400.00	8,600.00	8,800.00
	678.40	686.40	694.40	702.40	710.40	718.40	726.40
14.....	\$9,568.00	\$9,776.00	\$9,984.00	\$10,192.00	\$10,400.00	\$10,608.00	\$10,816.00
	8,800.00	9,000.00	9,200.00	9,400.00	9,600.00	9,800.00	10,000.00
	768.00	776.00	784.00	792.00	800.00	808.00	816.00
15.....	\$10,795.20	\$11,044.80	\$11,294.40	\$11,544.00	\$11,793.60	\$12,043.20	\$12,292.80
	10,000.00	10,250.00	10,500.00	10,750.00	11,000.00	11,250.00	11,500.00
	795.20	794.80	794.40	794.00	793.60	793.20	792.80
16.....	\$11,980.80	\$12,188.80	\$12,396.80	\$12,584.00	\$12,792.00	\$13,000.00	\$13,208.00
	11,200.00	11,400.00	11,600.00	11,800.00	12,000.00	12,200.00	12,400.00
	780.80	788.80	796.80	784.00	792.00	780.00	788.00
17.....	\$13,000.00	\$13,187.20	\$13,395.20	\$13,582.40	\$13,790.40	\$14,000.00	\$14,208.00
	12,200.00	12,400.00	12,600.00	12,800.00	13,000.00	13,200.00	13,400.00
	800.00	787.20	795.20	782.40	790.40	778.40	786.40
18.....	\$14,788.80						
	14,000.00						
	788.80						

¹ Proposed rates are shown on the first line for each grade. Present rates are shown on the second line. The amount of increase of each proposed rate over the present rate is shown on the third line.

TABLE 2.—*Proposed pay scales of the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule*¹

Grade	Per annum rates within grade						
1-----	\$1,643.20	\$1,705.60	\$1,768.00	\$1,830.40	\$1,892.80	\$1,955.20	\$2,017.60
	1,510.00	1,570.00	1,630.00	1,690.00	1,750.00	1,810.00	1,870.00
	133.20	135.60	138.00	140.40	142.80	145.20	147.60
2-----	\$2,308.80	\$2,392.00	\$2,475.20	\$2,558.40	\$2,641.60	\$2,724.80	\$2,808.00
	2,120.00	2,190.00	2,260.00	2,330.00	2,400.00	2,470.00	2,540.00
	188.80	202.00	215.20	228.40	241.60	254.80	268.00
3-----	\$2,454.40	\$2,537.60	\$2,620.80	\$2,704.00	\$2,787.20	\$2,870.40	\$2,953.60
	2,252.00	2,332.00	2,412.00	2,492.00	2,572.00	2,652.00	2,732.00
	202.40	205.60	208.80	212.00	215.20	218.40	221.60
4-----	\$2,662.40	\$2,745.60	\$2,828.80	\$2,912.00	\$2,995.20	\$3,078.40	\$3,161.60
	2,450.00	2,530.00	2,610.00	2,690.00	2,770.00	2,850.00	2,930.00
	212.40	215.60	218.80	222.00	225.20	228.40	231.60
5-----	\$2,912.00	\$2,995.20	\$3,078.40	\$3,161.60	\$3,244.80	\$3,328.00	\$3,411.20
	2,674.00	2,754.00	2,834.00	2,914.00	2,994.00	3,074.00	3,154.00
	238.00	241.20	244.40	247.60	250.80	254.00	257.20
6-----	\$3,161.60	\$3,244.80	\$3,328.00	\$3,411.20	\$3,494.40	\$3,577.60	\$3,660.80
	2,900.00	2,980.00	3,060.00	3,140.00	3,220.00	3,300.00	3,380.00
	261.60	264.80	268.00	271.20	274.40	277.60	280.80
7-----	\$3,390.40	\$3,494.40	\$3,598.40	\$3,702.40	\$3,806.40	\$3,910.40	\$4,014.40
	3,125.00	3,225.00	3,325.00	3,425.00	3,525.00	3,625.00	3,725.00
	265.40	269.40	273.40	277.40	281.40	285.40	289.40
8-----	\$3,702.40	\$3,827.20	\$3,952.00	\$4,076.80	\$4,201.60	\$4,326.40	\$4,451.20
	3,400.00	3,525.00	3,650.00	3,775.00	3,900.00	4,025.00	4,150.00
	302.40	302.20	302.00	301.80	301.60	301.40	301.20
9-----	\$4,097.60	\$4,222.40	\$4,347.20	\$4,472.00	\$4,596.80	\$4,721.60	\$4,846.40
	3,775.00	3,900.00	4,025.00	4,150.00	4,275.00	4,400.00	4,525.00
	322.60	322.40	322.20	322.00	321.80	321.60	321.40
10-----	\$4,513.60	\$4,638.40	\$4,763.20	\$4,888.00	\$5,012.80	\$5,137.60	\$5,262.40
	4,150.00	4,275.00	4,400.00	4,525.00	4,650.00	4,775.00	4,900.00
	363.60	363.40	363.20	363.00	362.80	362.60	362.40

Part-time	Charwomen	Head charwomen
Proposed per annum rate of	\$2,641.60	\$2,808.00
Present per annum rate of	2,400.00	2,540.00
Increase per annum rate of	241.60	268.00

¹ Proposed rates are shown on the first line for each grade. Present rates are shown on the second line. The amount of increase of each proposed rate over the present rate is shown on the third line.

EXPLANATION OF S. 622 BY SECTIONS

Section 1: This section relates to the compensation of employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

Subsection (a) amends sections 603 (b) and 603 (c) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, by setting forth new compensation schedules for the general schedule, and the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule and the annual, full-time rates for part-time charwomen (\$2,641.60) and head charwomen (\$2,808).

Subsection (b) of this section prescribes the rules by which the existing pay rates of employees are to be automatically adjusted to the new rates prescribed by the bill.

Most Classification Act employees are, of course, now paid at standard scheduled or longevity rates of their grades. For such employees, the transition from old to new rates is simple. As provided in paragraph (1), their existing rate will be automatically transferred to the new rate having the same relative place in their grade. The correspondence of old and new rates and the resulting increase may be determined, in any individual case, from the tables given above.

Some Classification Act employees, however, are paid at non-standard rates, because of the application of salary-saving clauses when some change took place in the status of their positions, e. g., the inclusion of their positions under the Classification Act for the first time when that act was revised in 1949. Also, a group of several thousand employees and their positions were later covered under the Classification Act by virtue of their transfer from the field service of the Post Office Department to the General Services Administration pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950. Prior to the transfer these employees had been paid under the Postal Pay Act (Public Law 134, approved July 6, 1945, as amended and supplemented). In both cases some employees had been receiving basic compensation at rates in excess of the uniform rates of the classification grade in which their positions were placed. Their pay was saved from reduction by provisions of the Classification Act itself, or by regulations of the Civil Service Commission. Special transition rules are provided in paragraphs (2) (A) and (2) (B) of the bill to assure that these employees will receive a pay increase in an orderly fashion.

Paragraph (2) (A) of subsection (b) provides that where, under the circumstances described above, an employee has been receiving a nonstandard rate of basic compensation less than the maximum longevity rate of his grade, his salary shall be converted to the rate he would have received under subsection (b) (1) if he had been receiving compensation at the next higher scheduled or longevity rate of his grade.

Paragraph (2) (B) of subsection (b) provides that the pay of an employee, who immediately prior to the effective date of the act was receiving a rate of basic compensation in excess of the maximum longevity rate of his grade, shall be increased by the amount of increase in the maximum longevity rate of his grade.

Paragraph (2) (C) of subsection (b) applies to a somewhat similar situation where part-time char employees are currently receiving rates of pay in excess of existing rates of the Classification Act. These employees also were transferred from the field service of the Post Office Department to the General Services Administration and were permitted to continue to receive the higher basic pay rates provided by the Postal Pay Act. The amount of increase in these cases will be at the same rate as that provided in the pay scales of the bill for part-time char employees.

Although these paragraphs of the bill provide pay increases for persons at nonstandard rates or at rates above the current maximum longevity rates, they do not change the provisions of the Classification Act, and the regulations issued thereunder, as they relate to the right to continue to receive such rates.

Subsection 1 (c) relates to the compensation of secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges. The Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1951, Public Law 759, Eighty-first Congress, provides that the salaries of employees in these positions be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, except that these salaries are required to conform to certain specified grades of that act. This authority is

limited by a provision in the Judiciary Appropriation Act which states—

That (exclusive of step-increases corresponding with those provided for by title VII of the Classification Act of 1949 and of compensation paid for temporary assistance needed because of an emergency) the aggregate salaries paid to secretaries and law clerks appointed by one judge shall not exceed \$9,600 per annum, except in the case of the chief judge of each circuit and the chief judge of each district court having five or more district judges, in which case the aggregate salaries shall not exceed \$13,050 per annum.

Subsection 1 (c) would increase these limitations by the amounts necessary to pay the additional compensation provided in the bill. This proposal is in line with the long-time policy of Congress to provide pay increases for this small group of employees to the same extent as employees directly under the Classification Act.

Subsection 1 (d) guards against any increase provided under the new schedules being considered an equivalent increase for periodic step increase purposes. An equivalent increase stops the running of the current waiting period of 52 to 78 weeks and begins a new waiting period. This provision was used in the salary increase acts of 1945, 1946, and 1948, and in the Classification Act of 1949.

ESTIMATE OF COST OF CLASSIFICATION ACT INCREASES

The annual increased cost of Classification Act increases based upon a coverage of 995,000 positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as of March 31, 1951, is estimated to be \$306,000,000. The average increase is \$307.53 or 8.4 percent. The increase in salaries to some 480 secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges under subsection 1 (c) is estimated at \$180,000.

Salary increases for employees of the legislative branch

Section 2 of S. 622 relates to employees in or under the legislative branch of the Government.

The committee proposes an 8.8-percent increase in gross salaries of officers and employees (other than Senators and Members of the House of Representatives) of the legislative branch of the Government.

The increase would not be automatic in the case of employees in the office of a Senator. The aggregate amount of the basic compensation authorized to be paid for administrative and clerical assistance and messenger service in the offices of Senators is increased by 8.8 percent.

Salary increases are limited to \$800 per annum in section 2.

Section 3 makes the effective date of the proposed act on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of its enactment.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

SECTIONS 603 (B) AND 603 (C) OF THE CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

[(b) The compensation schedule for the general schedule shall be as follows:

Grade	Per annum rates						
GS-1-----	\$2,200	\$2,280	\$2,360	\$2,440	\$2,520	\$2,600	\$2,680
GS-2-----	\$2,450	\$2,530	\$2,610	\$2,690	\$2,770	\$2,850	\$2,930
GS-3-----	\$2,650	\$2,730	\$2,810	\$2,890	\$2,970	\$3,050	\$3,130
GS-4-----	\$2,875	\$2,955	\$3,035	\$3,115	\$3,195	\$3,275	\$3,355
GS-5-----	\$3,100	\$3,225	\$3,350	\$3,475	\$3,600	\$3,725	\$3,850
GS-6-----	\$3,450	\$3,575	\$3,700	\$3,825	\$3,950	\$4,075	\$4,200
GS-7-----	\$3,825	\$3,950	\$4,075	\$4,200	\$4,325	\$4,450	\$4,575
GS-8-----	\$4,200	\$4,325	\$4,450	\$4,575	\$4,700	\$4,825	\$4,950
GS-9-----	\$4,600	\$4,725	\$4,850	\$4,975	\$5,100	\$5,225	\$5,350
GS-10-----	\$5,000	\$5,125	\$5,250	\$5,375	\$5,500	\$5,625	\$5,750
GS-11-----	\$5,400	\$5,600	\$5,800	\$6,000	\$6,200	\$6,400	
GS-12-----	\$6,400	\$6,600	\$6,800	\$7,000	\$7,200	\$7,400	
GS-13-----	\$7,600	\$7,800	\$8,000	\$8,200	\$8,400	\$8,600	
GS-14-----	\$8,800	\$9,000	\$9,200	\$9,400	\$9,600	\$9,800	
GS-15-----	\$10,000	\$10,250	\$10,500	\$10,750	\$11,000		
GS-16-----	\$11,200	\$11,400	\$11,600	\$11,800	\$12,000		
GS-17-----	\$12,200	\$12,400	\$12,600	\$12,800	\$13,000		
GS-18-----	\$14,000						

(c) (1) The compensation schedule for the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule shall be as follows:

Grade	Per annum rates						
CPC-1-----	\$1,510	\$1,570	\$1,630	\$1,690	\$1,750	\$1,810	\$1,870
CPC-2-----	\$2,120	\$2,190	\$2,260	\$2,330	\$2,400	\$2,470	\$2,540
CPC-3-----	\$2,252	\$2,332	\$2,412	\$2,492	\$2,572	\$2,652	\$2,732
CPC-4-----	\$2,450	\$2,530	\$2,610	\$2,690	\$2,770	\$2,850	\$2,930
CPC-5-----	\$2,674	\$2,754	\$2,834	\$2,914	\$2,994	\$3,074	\$3,154
CPC-6-----	\$2,900	\$2,980	\$3,060	\$3,140	\$3,220	\$3,300	\$3,380
CPC-7-----	\$3,125	\$3,225	\$3,325	\$3,425	\$3,525	\$3,625	\$3,725
CPC-8-----	\$3,400	\$3,525	\$3,650	\$3,775	\$3,900	\$4,025	\$4,150
CPC-9-----	\$3,775	\$3,900	\$4,025	\$4,150	\$4,275	\$4,400	\$4,525
CPC-10-----	\$4,150	\$4,275	\$4,400	\$4,525	\$4,650	\$4,775	\$4,900

(2) Charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of \$2,400 per annum, and head charwomen working part time at the rate of \$2,540 per annum.]

(b) The compensation schedule for the general schedule shall be as follows:

Grade	Per annum rates						
GS-1-----	\$2,592.00	\$2,475.20	\$2,558.40	\$2,641.60	\$2,724.80	\$2,808.00	\$2,891.20
GS-2-----	\$2,662.40	\$2,745.60	\$2,828.80	\$2,912.00	\$2,995.20	\$3,078.40	\$3,161.60
GS-3-----	\$2,891.20	\$2,974.40	\$3,057.60	\$3,140.80	\$3,224.00	\$3,307.20	\$3,390.40
GS-4-----	\$3,120.00	\$3,203.20	\$3,286.40	\$3,369.60	\$3,452.80	\$3,536.00	\$3,619.20
GS-5-----	\$3,360.60	\$3,494.40	\$3,619.20	\$3,744.00	\$3,868.80	\$3,993.60	\$4,118.40
GS-6-----	\$3,764.80	\$3,889.60	\$4,014.40	\$4,139.20	\$4,264.00	\$4,388.80	\$4,513.60
GS-7-----	\$4,160.00	\$4,284.80	\$4,409.60	\$4,534.40	\$4,659.20	\$4,784.00	\$4,908.80
GS-8-----	\$4,576.00	\$4,700.80	\$4,825.60	\$4,950.40	\$5,075.20	\$5,200.00	\$5,324.80
GS-9-----	\$5,012.80	\$5,137.60	\$5,262.40	\$5,387.20	\$5,512.00	\$5,636.80	\$5,761.60
GS-10-----	\$5,449.60	\$5,574.40	\$5,699.20	\$5,824.00	\$5,948.80	\$6,073.60	\$6,198.40
GS-11-----	\$5,886.40	\$6,094.40	\$6,302.40	\$6,510.40	\$6,718.40	\$6,926.40	
GS-12-----	\$6,968.00	\$7,176.00	\$7,384.00	\$7,592.00	\$7,800.00	\$8,008.00	
GS-13-----	\$8,278.40	\$8,486.40	\$8,694.40	\$8,902.40	\$9,110.40	\$9,318.40	
GS-14-----	\$9,568.00	\$9,776.00	\$9,984.00	\$10,192.00	\$10,400.00	\$10,608.00	
GS-15-----	\$10,795.20	\$11,044.80	\$11,294.40	\$11,544.00	\$11,793.60		
GS-16-----	\$11,980.80	\$12,188.80	\$12,396.80	\$12,584.00	\$12,792.00		
GS-17-----	\$13,000.00	\$13,187.20	\$13,395.20	\$13,582.40	\$13,790.40		
GS-18-----	\$14,788.80						

(c) (1) The compensation schedule for the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule shall be as follows:

Grade	Per annum rates						
CPC-1-----	\$1,648.20	\$1,705.60	\$1,768.00	\$1,830.40	\$1,892.80	\$1,955.20	\$2,017.60
CPC-2-----	2,308.80	2,392.00	2,475.20	2,558.40	2,641.60	2,724.80	2,808.00
CPC-3-----	2,454.40	2,537.60	2,620.80	2,704.00	2,787.20	2,870.40	2,953.60
CPC-4-----	2,662.40	2,745.60	2,828.80	2,912.00	2,995.20	3,078.40	3,161.60
CPC-5-----	2,912.00	2,995.20	3,078.40	3,161.60	3,244.80	3,328.00	3,411.20
CPC-6-----	3,161.60	3,244.80	3,328.00	3,411.20	3,494.40	3,577.60	3,660.80
CPC-7-----	3,390.40	3,494.40	3,598.40	3,702.40	3,806.40	3,910.40	4,014.40
CPC-8-----	3,702.40	3,827.20	3,952.00	4,076.80	4,201.60	4,326.40	4,451.20
CPC-9-----	4,097.60	4,222.40	4,347.20	4,472.00	4,596.80	4,721.60	4,846.40
CPC-10-----	4,513.60	4,638.40	4,763.20	4,888.00	5,012.80	5,137.60	5,262.40

(2) Charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of \$2,641.60 per annum, and head charwomen working part time at the rate of \$2,808 per annum.

SECOND PROVISIO IN PARAGRAPH IN LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION ACT
1947, RELATING TO THE AUTHORITY OF SENATORS TO REARRANGE BASIC
SALARIES OF EMPLOYEES IN THEIR RESPECTIVE OFFICES

Provided further, That no salary shall be fixed under this paragraph at a basic rate of more than **[\$5,280]** \$5,820 per annum, except that the salary of one employee, other than the administrative assistant, in the office of each Senator may be fixed at a basic rate of not more than **[\$6,720]** \$7,320 per annum and the salary of the administrative assistant to each Senator may be fixed at a basic rate of not more than \$8,400 per annum.

PARAGRAPH DESIGNATED "FOLDING DOCUMENTS" UNDER THE HEADING "CON-
TINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE" IN LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION
ACT

Folding documents: For folding speeches and pamphlets at a basic rate not exceeding **[\$1 per thousand]** \$2 per thousand, \$28,875.

○

5. 62.

6. 71.

82^D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 622

[Report No. 560]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 22 (legislative day, JANUARY 8), 1951

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. ECTON) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

JULY 20 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1951

Reported by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, with an amendment

[Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That all the basic rates of compensation provided in title
4 ~~VI~~ of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, are hereby
5 increased by 17 per centum: *Provided*, That the 17 per
6 centum authorized herein shall be payable only on that part
7 of an employee's compensation not in excess of \$5,000 per
8 annum or hourly equivalent thereof.

9 SEC. 2. The increases in basic rates of compensation pro-
10 vided in this Act shall not be construed to be an equivalent

1 increase in compensation within the meaning of section 701
2 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

3 SEC. 3. The increases in basic rates of compensation pro-
4 vided in this Act shall apply to the basic compensation rates
5 of positions established under another pay and classification
6 system in which the incumbents have been transferred to
7 coverage under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

8 SEC. 4. This Act shall become effective upon the first
9 day of the first pay period which begins after enactment.
10 That (a) sections 603 (b) and 603 (c) of the Classification
11 Act of 1949, approved October 28, 1949, as amended, are
12 hereby amended to read as follows:

13 “(b) The compensation schedule for the general schedule
14 shall be as follows:

“Grade	Per annum rates						
GS-1-----	\$2,392.00	\$2,475.20	\$2,558.40	\$2,641.60	\$2,724.80	\$2,808.00	\$2,891.20
GS-2-----	\$2,662.40	\$2,745.60	\$2,828.80	\$2,912.00	\$2,995.20	\$3,078.40	\$3,161.60
GS-3-----	\$2,891.20	\$2,974.40	\$3,057.60	\$3,140.80	\$3,224.00	\$3,307.20	\$3,390.40
GS-4-----	\$3,120.00	\$3,203.20	\$3,286.40	\$3,369.60	\$3,452.80	\$3,536.00	\$3,619.20
GS-5-----	\$3,369.60	\$3,494.40	\$3,619.20	\$3,744.00	\$3,868.80	\$3,993.60	\$4,118.40
GS-6-----	\$3,764.80	\$3,889.60	\$4,014.40	\$4,139.20	\$4,264.00	\$4,388.80	\$4,513.60
GS-7-----	\$4,160.00	\$4,284.80	\$4,409.60	\$4,534.40	\$4,659.20	\$4,784.00	\$4,908.80
GS-8-----	\$4,576.00	\$4,700.80	\$4,825.60	\$4,950.40	\$5,075.20	\$5,200.00	\$5,324.80
GS-9-----	\$5,012.80	\$5,137.60	\$5,262.40	\$5,387.20	\$5,512.00	\$5,636.80	\$5,761.60
GS-10-----	\$5,449.60	\$5,574.40	\$5,699.20	\$5,824.00	\$5,948.80	\$6,073.60	\$6,198.40
GS-11-----	\$5,886.40	\$6,094.40	\$6,302.40	\$6,510.40	\$6,718.40	\$6,926.40	
GS-12-----	\$6,968.00	\$7,176.00	\$7,384.00	\$7,592.00	\$7,800.00	\$8,008.00	
GS-13-----	\$8,278.40	\$8,486.40	\$8,694.40	\$8,902.40	\$9,110.40	\$9,318.40	
GS-14-----	\$9,568.00	\$9,776.00	\$9,984.00	\$10,192.00	\$10,400.00	\$10,587.20	
GS-15-----	\$10,795.20	\$11,044.80	\$11,294.40	\$11,544.00	\$11,793.60		
GS-16-----	\$11,980.80	\$12,188.80	\$12,396.80	\$12,584.00	\$12,792.00		
GS-17-----	\$13,000.00	\$13,187.20	\$13,395.20	\$13,582.40	\$13,790.40		
GS-18-----	\$14,788.80						

15 “(c) (1) The compensation schedule for the crafts,
16 protective, and custodial schedule shall be as follows:

“Grade	Per annum rates						
CPC-1-----	\$1,643.20	\$1,705.60	\$1,768.00	\$1,830.40	\$1,892.80	\$1,955.20	\$2,017.60
CPC-2-----	\$2,308.80	\$2,392.00	\$2,475.20	\$2,558.40	\$2,641.60	\$2,724.80	\$2,808.00
CPC-3-----	\$2,454.40	\$2,537.60	\$2,620.80	\$2,704.00	\$2,787.20	\$2,870.40	\$2,953.60
CPC-4-----	\$2,662.40	\$2,745.60	\$2,828.80	\$2,912.00	\$2,995.20	\$3,078.40	\$3,161.60
CPC-5-----	\$2,912.00	\$2,995.20	\$3,078.40	\$3,161.60	\$3,244.80	\$3,328.00	\$3,411.20
CPC-6-----	\$3,161.60	\$3,244.80	\$3,328.00	\$3,411.20	\$3,494.40	\$3,577.60	\$3,660.80
CPC-7-----	\$3,390.40	\$3,494.40	\$3,598.40	\$3,702.40	\$3,806.40	\$3,910.40	\$4,014.40
CPC-8-----	\$3,702.40	\$3,827.20	\$3,952.00	\$4,076.80	\$4,201.60	\$4,326.40	\$4,451.20
CPC-9-----	\$4,097.60	\$4,222.40	\$4,347.20	\$4,472.00	\$4,596.80	\$4,721.60	\$4,846.40
CPC-10-----	\$4,513.60	\$4,638.40	\$4,763.20	\$4,888.00	\$5,012.80	\$5,137.60	\$5,262.40

1 “(2) Charwomen working part time shall be paid at the
2 rate of \$2,641.60 per annum, and head charwomen working
3 part time at the rate of \$2,808 per annum.”

4 (b) In adjusting initially the rates of pay of employees
5 affected by the provisions of this section—

6 (1) an employee receiving basic compensation im-
7 mediately prior to the effective date of this Act at one of
8 the scheduled or longevity rates provided by the Classifi-
9 cation Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive basic
10 compensation on and after the effective date of this Act
11 at the corresponding scheduled or longevity rate as
12 increased by this Act; and

13 (2) an employee receiving basic compensation im-
14 mediately prior to the effective date of this Act at a rate
15 other than a scheduled or longevity rate provided by the
16 Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive
17 basic compensation on and after the effective date of this
18 Act as follows:

19 (A) If his rate immediately prior to the effec-
20 tive date of this Act was less than the maximum
21 longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at the
22 scheduled or longevity rate which he would receive
23 under paragraph (1) had he been receiving basic
24 compensation immediately prior to such effective
25 date at the scheduled or longevity rate next higher

1 *than his rate of basic compensation immediately*
2 *prior to such effective date.*

3 *(B) If his rate immediately prior to the effec-*
4 *tive date of this Act was in excess of the maximum*
5 *longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at a rate*
6 *equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately*
7 *prior to such date, increased by an amount equal to*
8 *the amount of the increase made by this Act in such*
9 *maximum longevity rate.*

10 *(C) If he is a part-time char employee and his rate*
11 *immediately prior to the effective date of this Act was*
12 *in excess of the rate provided for his position under*
13 *section 603 (c) (2) of the Classification Act of 1949,*
14 *as amended, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the*
15 *rate at which he was paid immediately prior to such*
16 *effective date, increased by an amount equal to the*
17 *amount of the increase made by this Act in the rate*
18 *for like positions under such section.*

19 *(c) The limitations of \$9,600 and \$13,050 with respect*
20 *to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks*
21 *of circuit and district judges, contained in the sixteenth para-*
22 *graph under the head "Miscellaneous salaries" in the Judi-*
23 *ciary Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 759, Eighty-*
24 *first Congress), or in any subsequent appropriation Act, shall*

1 *be increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional*
2 *basic compensation provided by this Act.*

3 *(d) The increase in existing rates of basic compensation*
4 *provided by this Act shall not be construed to be an equivalent*
5 *increase in compensation within the meaning of section 701*
6 *of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.*

7 *SEC. 2. (a) Each officer or employee in or under the*
8 *legislative branch of the Government (other than an employee*
9 *in the office of a Senator) whose rate of compensation is in-*
10 *creased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of*
11 *1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of*
12 *(1) 8.8 per centum of the aggregate rate of his basic com-*
13 *penetration and the rate of the additional compensation received*
14 *by him under sections 501 and 502 of the Federal Employees*
15 *Pay Act of 1945, as amended, section 301 of the Postal Rate*
16 *Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and*
17 *the provisions under the heading "Increased pay for legisla-*
18 *tive employees" in the Second Supplemental Appropriation*
19 *Act, 1950, or (2) \$800 per annum, whichever is the lesser.*

20 *(b) The provisions of section 603 (b) of the Federal*
21 *Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, section 7 (b)*
22 *of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, as amended,*
23 *section 303 (c) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal*
24 *Employees Salary Act of 1948, and the provisions of para-*

1 graph (b) under the heading "Increased pay for legislative
2 employees" in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act,
3 1950, shall not apply to officers or employees subject to the
4 provisions of subsection (a) or to employees in the offices of
5 Senators, but no officer or employee of the Senate or House
6 of Representatives shall be paid with respect to any pay
7 period basic compensation or basic compensation plus addi-
8 tional compensation at a rate in excess of \$11,646 per annum
9 unless expressly authorized by law.

10 (c) (1) The aggregate amount of the basic compensa-
11 tion authorized to be paid for administrative and clerical
12 assistance and messenger service in the offices of Senators
13 is hereby increased by—

14 (A) \$3,540 in the case of Senators from States the
15 population of which is less than three million;

16 (B) \$3,720 in the case of Senators from States the
17 population of which is three million or more but less than
18 five million;

19 (C) \$4,260 in the case of Senators from States the
20 population of which is five million or more but less than
21 ten million; and

22 (D) \$4,440 in the case of Senators from States the
23 population of which is ten million or more.

24 (2) The second proviso in the paragraph relating to the
25 authority of Senators to rearrange the basic salaries of em-

1 *ployees in their respective offices, which appears in the Legis-*
2 *lative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, as amended (2*
3 *U. S. C. 60f), is amended by striking out “\$5,280” and*
4 *inserting in lieu thereof “\$5,820”; and by striking out*
5 *“\$6,720” and inserting in lieu thereof “\$7,320”.*

6 *(d) The Legislative Branch Appropriation Act is*
7 *amended by striking out, in the paragraph designated “Fold-*
8 *ing documents” under the heading “Contingent expenses of*
9 *the Senate” the words “\$1 per thousand” and inserting in lieu*
10 *thereof “\$2 per thousand”. The provisions of subsection (a),*
11 *and the provisions of law referred to in such subsection, shall*
12 *not apply to employees whose compensation is paid from the*
13 *appropriation contained in such paragraph.*

14 *(e) The rate of basic compensation of each of the elected*
15 *officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives (not*
16 *including the presiding officers of the two Houses), and of the*
17 *legislative counsel of the Senate and the legislative counsel*
18 *of the House of Representatives, are hereby increased by*
19 *8.8 per centum or \$800 per annum, whichever is the lesser.*

20 *SEC. 3. This Act shall become effective on the first day*
21 *of the first pay period which begins after the date of its*
22 *enactment.*

82^d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 622

[Report No. 560]

A BILL

To increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr.
LANGER, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. ECTON

JANUARY 22 (legislative day, JANUARY 8), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Post
Office and Civil Service

JULY 20 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1951

Reported with an amendment

Mr. CARLSON. So far the House has not acted on such a provision. It will go to the House, and the House will have plenty of opportunity to work it out.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me explain my position, which I hope the Senator will understand. I shall not take very much time.

The central post offices are entirely different from ordinary post offices, as the gentleman sitting by the Senator's side well knows. They are the post offices into which there flow moneys from the other post offices, so that the postmaster of a central post office has much greater responsibility; he is responsible not only for what he takes in in his own office, but for that which flows into his office from tributary post offices. It has always seemed to me that those central post offices should have different consideration. I therefore respectfully suggest to the chairman of the committee and to those who will be in the conference that if it is possible the amendment should be so worked out that different consideration may be given to postmasters of central post offices.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I assure the Senator from Nevada that if the amendment goes to conference, and I am quite sure it will, the matter will be looked into and cared for, because I think the point is well worth considering.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas, for himself and the Senator from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "A" and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 28, following line 23, it is proposed to insert new section 21, as follows:

SEC. 21. Subsection (e) of section 17 of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service, to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"(e) In addition to the salaries provided in this section, each carrier in the rural delivery service shall be paid for equipment maintenance a sum equal to (1) 9 cents per mile per day for each mile or major fraction of a mile scheduled or (2) \$3.50 per day, whichever is the greater. Payments for equipment and maintenance as provided herein shall be at the same periods and in the same manner as payments for regular compensation to rural carriers."

On page 29, change "Sec. 21." to "Sec. 22."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to modify my amendment by changing the figure "\$3.50" to "\$3", on page 2, line 3.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may modify his amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I do not think it will take a great deal of time to explain my amendment, since an amendment almost identical, in fact, a little bit more extravagant, or, let me say, more expensive than this amend-

ment, was adopted unanimously by the Senate in the month of September 1949.

In other words, the same provision, in the form of a bill, was before the Senate, was discussed, and was adopted unanimously. It provided 9 cents per mile for equipment maintenance allowance, and \$3.50 as a basic minimum pay. But I have felt that since we have increased the base salary, and since we have provided the \$400 floor and \$800 ceiling increase for the postal workers, we could reduce the minimum for maintenance allowance to \$3 instead of \$3.50.

Lest anyone should think this is unusual, let me point out that the present rate for a rural letter carrier is 8 cents per mile. That was adopted in 1949. Ask any member of this body who has purchased an automobile and who has had his automobile serviced or repaired at a garage or a filling station since 1949, whether the cost of automobiles, the maintenance of equipment, and the cost of new equipment, has not gone up substantially since that time. In fact, we have just been notified by the Office of Economic Stabilization that the price of automobiles may well go up another 10 percent. We know that the price of tires has risen. We know that the price of equipment for cars has gone up. We know also that rural roads are in none too good shape. So I feel this amendment is entirely worthy and that it surely should have the support of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator's amendment would change the rate in the present law from 8 cents to 9 cents.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. At the present time there is nothing in the law in regard to a guaranty of receiving \$2 or \$3, or any other amount.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There has been some objection, of course, to the \$3 figure. I think it is true that where a route covers a short mileage, say 10, 12, 15, or 18 miles a day, the carrier certainly has to do a great deal of starting and stopping his car, so that he ought to receive more per mile. The only way that can be accomplished is as provided by the Senator's amendment. We passed a bill in the Senate last year identical in language to the Senator's amendment, and it went to the House, but was not passed by the House. Mr. President, I do not object to the amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I believe the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota has much merit. I not only think that an increase from 8 to 9 cents is commendable, but that it should be made. As to the dollars, I am not positive. I am pleased that the Senator reduced his proposal from \$3.50 to \$3. I think that is something, however, which should be studied, and I hope it will be studied in conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, it is proposed to strike out all of section 21, and insert in lieu thereof the words, "this act shall become effective as of July 1, 1951."

Mr. LANGER. It is my understanding, Mr. President, that there is no objection to the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We have no objection to taking it to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there is no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 355) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish at this time to commend the members of the subcommittee for the work they have done on the bill. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] acted as chairman of the subcommittee, and did excellent work. I also want to commend the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] for the excellent work they did in preparing the bill and reporting it to the full committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed as passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORGANIZATION OF AIR FORCE AND DEPARTMENT OF AIR FORCE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1726) to provide for the organization of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives, pp. 11641-11642.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

PAY INCREASES FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 622, Calendar 531.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That (a) sections 603 (b) and 603 (c) of the Classification Act of 1949, approved October 28, 1949, as amended, are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the general schedule shall be as follows:

be construed to be an equivalent increase in compensation within the meaning of section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

SEC. 2. (a) Each officer or employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government (other than an employee in the office of a Senator) whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of (1) 8.8 percent of the aggregate rate of his basic compensation and the rate of the additional compensation received by him under sections 501 and 502 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, section 301 of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and the provisions under the heading "Increased pay for legislative employees" in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, or (2) \$800 per annum, whichever is the lesser.

(b) The provisions of section 603 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, section 7 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, as amended, section 303 (c) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and the provisions of paragraph (b) under the heading "Increased pay for legislative employees" in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, shall not apply to officers or employees subject to the provisions of subsection (a) or to employees in the offices of Senators, but no officer or employee of the Senate or House of Representatives shall be paid with respect to any pay period basic compensation or basic compensation plus additional compensation at a rate in excess of \$11,646 per annum unless expressly authorized by law.

(c) (1) The aggregate amount of the basic compensation authorized to be paid for administrative and clerical assistance and messenger service in the offices of Senators is hereby increased by—

(A) \$3,540 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is less than 3,000,000;

(B) \$3,720 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is 3,000,000 or more but less than 5,000,000;

(C) \$4,260 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is 5,000,000 or more but less than 10,000,000; and

(D) \$4,440 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is 10,000,000 or more.

(2) The second proviso in the paragraph relating to the authority of Senators to rearrange the basic salaries of employees in their respective offices, which appears in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, as amended (2 U. S. C. 60f), is amended by striking out "\$5,280" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$5,820;" and by striking out "\$6,720" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$7,320".

(d) The Legislative Branch Appropriation Act is amended by striking out, in the paragraph designated "Folding documents" under the heading "Contingent expenses of the Senate" the words "\$1 per thousand" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2 per thousand." The provisions of subsection (a), and the provisions of law referred to in such subsection, shall not apply to employees whose compensation is paid from the appropriation contained in such paragraph.

(e) The rate of basic compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives (not including the presiding officers of the two Houses), and of the legislative counsel of the Senate and the legislative counsel of the House of Representatives, are hereby increased by 8.8 percent or \$800 per annum, whichever is the lesser.

SEC. 3. This act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of its enactment.

"Grade	Per annum rates						
GS-1	\$2,392.00	\$2,475.20	\$2,558.40	\$2,641.60	\$2,724.80	\$2,808.00	\$2,891.20
GS-2	\$2,662.40	\$2,745.60	\$2,828.80	\$2,912.00	\$2,995.20	\$3,078.40	\$3,161.60
GS-3	\$2,891.20	\$2,974.40	\$3,057.60	\$3,140.80	\$3,224.00	\$3,307.20	\$3,390.40
GS-4	\$3,120.00	\$3,203.20	\$3,286.40	\$3,369.60	\$3,452.80	\$3,536.00	\$3,619.20
GS-5	\$3,369.60	\$3,452.80	\$3,536.00	\$3,619.20	\$3,702.40	\$3,785.60	\$3,868.80
GS-6	\$3,764.80	\$3,848.00	\$3,931.20	\$4,014.40	\$4,097.60	\$4,180.80	\$4,264.00
GS-7	\$4,160.00	\$4,243.20	\$4,326.40	\$4,409.60	\$4,492.80	\$4,576.00	\$4,659.20
GS-8	\$4,576.00	\$4,659.20	\$4,742.40	\$4,825.60	\$4,908.80	\$4,992.00	\$5,075.20
GS-9	\$5,012.80	\$5,096.00	\$5,179.20	\$5,262.40	\$5,345.60	\$5,428.80	\$5,512.00
GS-10	\$5,449.60	\$5,532.80	\$5,616.00	\$5,699.20	\$5,782.40	\$5,865.60	\$5,948.80
GS-11	\$5,886.40	\$5,969.60	\$6,052.80	\$6,136.00	\$6,219.20	\$6,302.40	\$6,385.60
GS-12	\$6,323.20	\$6,406.40	\$6,489.60	\$6,572.80	\$6,656.00	\$6,739.20	\$6,822.40
GS-13	\$6,760.00	\$6,843.20	\$6,926.40	\$7,009.60	\$7,092.80	\$7,176.00	\$7,259.20
GS-14	\$7,196.80	\$7,280.00	\$7,363.20	\$7,446.40	\$7,529.60	\$7,612.80	\$7,696.00
GS-15	\$7,633.60	\$7,716.80	\$7,800.00	\$7,883.20	\$7,966.40	\$8,049.60	\$8,132.80
GS-16	\$8,070.40	\$8,153.60	\$8,236.80	\$8,320.00	\$8,403.20	\$8,486.40	\$8,569.60
GS-17	\$8,507.20	\$8,590.40	\$8,673.60	\$8,756.80	\$8,840.00	\$8,923.20	\$9,006.40
GS-18	\$8,944.00	\$9,027.20	\$9,110.40	\$9,193.60	\$9,276.80	\$9,360.00	\$9,443.20

"(c) (1) The compensation schedule for the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates						
CPC-1	\$1,643.20	\$1,705.60	\$1,768.00	\$1,830.40	\$1,892.80	\$1,955.20	\$2,017.60
CPC-2	\$2,308.80	\$2,371.20	\$2,433.60	\$2,496.00	\$2,558.40	\$2,620.80	\$2,683.20
CPC-3	\$2,454.40	\$2,516.80	\$2,579.20	\$2,641.60	\$2,704.00	\$2,766.40	\$2,828.80
CPC-4	\$2,662.40	\$2,724.80	\$2,787.20	\$2,849.60	\$2,912.00	\$2,974.40	\$3,036.80
CPC-5	\$2,912.00	\$2,974.40	\$3,036.80	\$3,099.20	\$3,161.60	\$3,224.00	\$3,286.40
CPC-6	\$3,161.60	\$3,224.00	\$3,286.40	\$3,348.80	\$3,411.20	\$3,473.60	\$3,536.00
CPC-7	\$3,390.40	\$3,452.80	\$3,515.20	\$3,577.60	\$3,640.00	\$3,702.40	\$3,764.80
CPC-8	\$3,702.40	\$3,764.80	\$3,827.20	\$3,889.60	\$3,952.00	\$4,014.40	\$4,076.80
CPC-9	\$4,014.40	\$4,076.80	\$4,139.20	\$4,201.60	\$4,264.00	\$4,326.40	\$4,388.80
CPC-10	\$4,326.40	\$4,388.80	\$4,451.20	\$4,513.60	\$4,576.00	\$4,638.40	\$4,700.80

"(2) Charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of \$2,641.60 per annum, and head charwomen working part time at the rate of \$2,808 per annum."

(b) In adjusting initially the rates of pay of employees affected by the provisions of this section—

(1) an employee receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this act at one of the scheduled or longevity rates provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this act at the corresponding scheduled or longevity rate as increased by this act; and

(2) an employee receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this act at a rate other than a scheduled or longevity rate provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this act as follows:

(A) If his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this act was less than the maximum longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at the scheduled or longevity rate which he would receive under paragraph (1) had he been receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date at the scheduled or longevity rate next higher than his rate of basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date.

(B) If his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this act was in excess of the maximum longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately prior to such date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this act in such maximum longevity rate.

(C) If he is a part-time char employee and his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this act was in excess of the rate provided for his position under section 603 (c) (2) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately prior to such effective date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this act in the rate for like positions under such section.

(c) The limitations of \$9,600 and \$13,050 with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges, contained in the sixteenth paragraph under the head "Miscellaneous salaries" in the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 759, 81st Cong.), or in any subsequent appropriation Act, shall be increased by the amounts necessary to pay additional basic compensation provided by this act.

(d) The increase in existing rates of basic compensation provided by this act shall not

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the acting majority leader a question. It is not his intention to proceed with the consideration of the bill tonight, is it?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We desire to start considering it. It is just a little after 6 o'clock, and we would like to finish it if possible. It is very much like the bill the Senate has just acted upon. It deals with an increase in pay to Federal employees. It seems to me we could dispose of it in a comparatively short time. I should like at least to have the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] explain the bill to the Senate, and then if the Senate sees fit to proceed and complete consideration of it, very well. If not, that is all right. But I should like to have it finished today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator know whether there will be any considerable discussion of amendments which are to be offered?

Mr. PASTORE. No.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not know of many amendments.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the so-called Carlson amendment affect this bill?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It may be discussed in connection with this bill. I do not know. Someone may offer that amendment.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me so I may submit an amendment?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. The acting minority leader, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], asked if there were any amendments to be proposed to the bill. I have an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have printed. I assume from what the acting majority leader has said that we will not finish the bill tonight. I also would like to submit a statement to be printed in the RECORD relative to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The statement by Mr. McMAHON is as follows:

REGARDING S. 622: FACTS CONCERNING PAY RAISE FOR FOREIGN SERVICE PERSONNEL

1. Foreign Service not included: According to the staff of the Civil Service Committee, Foreign Service personnel were not included in S. 622 because the Foreign Service is under the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee. The Foreign Relations Committee has not had an opportunity to consider this matter this session.

2. House action: On the House side, however, H. R. 339 as reported, and as now on the House Calendar provides for the same increase for Foreign Service personnel as is provided for other personnel, i. e. a flat \$400 raise.

3. Cost: The proposed amendment would apply to 8,735 employees in the Foreign Service, whose annual average salary is \$5,010. Using the 8.4 percent raise figures, the annual cost of the raise will be about \$3,800,000.

4. Erroneous figures in House report: The report of the House committee on H. R. 339 refers to 19,203 Foreign Service employees and says the annual cost of the \$400 raise would be \$7,681,200 (see House report, p. 4). This figure is wrong as it includes foreign employees who would not in fact be covered by the pending amendment.

5. Past practice: The last cost-of-living pay raise did not cover Foreign Service employees. As a result, Congress about a year later passed a separate law fixing the same raise to Foreign Service personnel (see Public Law 160, 81st Cong.). Earlier raises, however, were also applied to Foreign Service personnel.

6. Sections of Foreign Service law amended by proposal: The sections which follow show the salaries as of today, except that they have each been increased by Public Law 160, by \$330, and except that this raise did not apply to salaries over \$10,000.

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

SEC. 412.¹ There shall be seven classes of Foreign Service officers, including the class of career minister. The per annum salary of a career minister shall be \$13,500. The per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the other classes shall be as follows:

Class 1, \$12,000, \$12,400, \$12,800, \$13,200, \$13,500;
Class 2, \$10,330, \$10,350, \$10,700, \$11,050, \$11,400, \$11,750, \$11,900
Class 3, \$8,330, \$8,630, \$8,930, \$9,230, \$9,530, \$9,830, \$10,130, \$10,230
Class 4, \$6,330, \$6,630, \$6,930, \$7,230, \$7,530, \$7,830, \$8,130, \$8,230;
Class 5, \$4,830, \$5,030, \$5,230, \$5,430, \$5,630, \$5,830, \$6,030, \$6,230;
Class 6, \$3,630, \$3,830, \$4,030, \$4,230, \$4,430, \$4,630, \$4,730.

FOREIGN SERVICE STAFF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

SEC. 415. There shall be 22 classes of Foreign Service staff officers and employees, referred to hereafter as staff officers and employees. The per annum rates of salary of staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

Class 1, \$9,150, \$9,450, \$9,750, \$10,050, \$10,330;
Class 2, \$8,430, \$8,670, \$8,910, \$9,150, \$9,450;
Class 3, \$7,710, \$7,950, \$8,190, \$8,430, \$8,670;
Class 4, \$6,990, \$7,230, \$7,470, \$7,710, \$7,950;
Class 5, \$6,450, \$6,630, \$6,810, \$6,990, \$7,230, \$7,470;
Class 6, \$5,910, \$6,090, \$6,270, \$6,450, \$6,630, \$6,810;
Class 7, \$5,370, \$5,550, \$5,730, \$5,910, \$6,090, \$6,270;
Class 8, \$4,830, \$5,010, \$5,190, \$5,370, \$5,550, \$5,730;
Class 9, \$4,290, \$4,470, \$4,650, \$4,830, \$5,010, \$5,190;
Class 10, \$3,930, \$4,050, \$4,170, \$4,290, \$4,470, \$4,650, \$4,830;
Class 11, \$3,570, \$3,690, \$3,810, \$3,930, \$4,050, \$4,170, \$4,290;
Class 12, \$3,210, \$3,330, \$3,450, \$3,570, \$3,690, \$3,810, \$3,930;
Class 13, \$2,850, \$2,970, \$3,090, \$3,210, \$3,330, \$3,450, \$3,570;
Class 14, \$2,490, \$2,610, \$2,730, \$2,850, \$2,970, \$3,090, \$3,210;
Class 15, \$2,310, \$2,370, \$2,430, \$2,490, \$2,610, \$2,730, \$2,850;
Class 16, \$2,130, \$2,190, \$2,250, \$2,310, \$2,370, \$2,430, \$2,490;
Class 17, \$1,950, \$2,010, \$2,070, \$2,130, \$2,190, \$2,250, \$2,310;
Class 18, \$1,770, \$1,830, \$1,890, \$1,950, \$2,010, \$2,070, \$2,130;

¹ Amended by Public Law 160, 81st Cong.; see appendix IV.

Class 19, \$1,590, \$1,650, \$1,710, \$1,770, \$1,830, \$1,890, \$1,950;
Class 20, \$1,410, \$1,470, \$1,530, \$1,590, \$1,650, \$1,710, \$1,770;
Class 21, \$1,230, \$1,290, \$1,350, \$1,410, \$1,470, \$1,530, \$1,590;
Class 22, \$1,050, \$1,110, \$1,170, \$1,230, \$1,290, \$1,350, \$1,410.

Mr. McMAHON. I may say, for the information of the Senate, that this amendment is designed to include the Foreign Service personnel in the general pay bill. Their pay was increased last year in a separate bill when we increased the pay of the civil-service workers. There is no reason why they should not be included in the present proposed pay raise.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. The amendment relates to the judicial branch of the Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, between lines 18 and 19, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

(c) (1) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed pursuant to section 62 (2) of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C. 102 (a) (2)), section 3656 of title 18 of the United States Code, the second and third sentences of section 603, section 604 (5), or sections 671 to 675, inclusive, of title 28 of the United States Code, or who are appointed pursuant to section 792 (b) of title 28 of the United States Code, are hereby increased by amounts equal to the increases provided by subsections (a) and (b) in corresponding rates of compensation paid to officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949.

On page 4, line 19, strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)."

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to bring the pay of employees of the judiciary who are under the classified rates of pay into the same bill with the pay of other Federal employees, so that they will receive the same pay increase. It costs them just as much to buy groceries as it costs anyone else. Otherwise, it will be necessary to pass a special bill to take care of them. If they can be taken care of in this bill, and covered in with the other employees, I think that should be done. Their rate of pay is based upon the classified rates of pay of all other Federal employees under civil service. In fact, many of these employees are under civil service, but they are treated as a separate type of employee. The only purpose of the amendment is to bring both types of employees in under the same bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCARRAN. As I understand, this amendment would not increase the salaries of judges.

Mr. KILGORE. Oh, no.

Mr. McCARRAN. It relates only to the salaries of employees who serve under them?

Mr. KILGORE. It relates to employees in the classified pay group, who should be treated the same as civil-service employees.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield the floor?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield for a question.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator from West Virginia realize that the judicial branch of the Government already has authority to raise salaries without any act? All it needs to do, of course, is to get the money from the Appropriations Committees. The judicial branch has the authority to raise salaries now.

Mr. KILGORE. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island that I realize that, but I have also checked the pay of deputy marshals, deputy clerks, and employees of the bankruptcy department, and I have discovered that under the limitation those salaries have not been raised commensurately with other salaries. These employees are employed by the same government. They serve the same purpose, and it is clear that they should be treated just as are other employees who are operating mostly in the same buildings in which they operate. This amendment applies to the field service. It does not affect the salaries of judges. It does not affect the salaries of clerks of courts, or the salaries of marshals. It does affect the salaries of the groups under them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield for a question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As acting minority leader I should like to ask the majority leader whether or not it would be wise to defer further consideration of this bill until Monday. It is my information that the tax bill will not be before the Senate until Wednesday. We shall have 2 days to consider this bill, and the air mail subsidy bill. There are amendments to be proposed to this bill, and it may be difficult to understand them. We have just passed another bill which may or may not affect this bill. It seems to me that it would be much wiser to postpone further consideration of the bill until Monday.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have not the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to make an observation in reply to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KILGORE. If I may have unanimous consent to yield without losing the floor, I am glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I think the bill now before the Senate is a very simple bill. I do not

believe that there is any Member of the Senate who does not realize that we must do for the classified employees what we have just done for the postal employees. That has been the tacit understanding right along.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with that statement.

Mr. PASTORE. We have debated this subject at length. We were given notice by the majority leader that there were three bills on the calendar, and that he hoped we might pass at least two of them today. I think it would not require more than half or three-quarters of an hour to pass the bill. If we do not pass it, next week we shall be deluged with mail from persons who might be effected by the bill. I think it would be well to stay here for an hour or so and pass the bill tonight.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I am glad to yield, but I have not the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator's opinion as to how the Carlson amendment would affect this bill. In fairness to all other employees, as compared with the postal employees, will we not have to consider in connection with this bill an amendment similar to the Carlson amendment?

Mr. PASTORE. I think that is the sense of the Senate at the moment. I do not see how we can escape it. It is argued that anyone in the lower brackets has been affected by the impact of the rise in the cost of living to the extent that we must give him an increase of \$400. Why should we not say the same thing with respect to those in the classified service?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with what the Senator has said. Is the Senator ready to state the effects of such an amendment, and where it would go in the pending bill?

Mr. PASTORE. We know the effect it would have on the pending bill to just as full an extent as we know the effect on the bill which we have just passed.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I am glad to yield under the same terms and conditions as heretofore.

Mr. McFARLAND. This question has been raised and presented to me. Some Senators say that the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] presents a new and different problem in regard to the Foreign Service. I do not know how long it may take to complete consideration of the bill. Of course, I should prefer to finish it; but, as has been stated, we probably shall not be able to reach the tax measure until Wednesday. So we will be able to complete action on this bill early next week.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

There are some questions in the minds of certain Senators in regard to the Foreign Service proposal. I do not know what consideration the committee has given to that proposal. Evidently the committee did not include it in this bill.

How long is it going to take to debate this amendment? I think the Senate is entitled to know all about it, and to know fully what the effect of such an amendment would be. Of course, I should prefer to complete consideration of the bill, but if there is to be some question with regard to it, I should like to have it go over until Monday. I had understood that the pattern had been set; but I am told that the amendment in regard to the Foreign Service is something new and different, and should be given careful consideration.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I am glad to yield under the same terms and conditions.

Mr. PASTORE. I may say for the information of the distinguished Senator from Arizona and other Members of the Senate that we have no jurisdiction over the Foreign Service. That was the case from the beginning. This bill has been on the calendar for about 3 months. The question which has been raised is one which must be handled by the Foreign Relations Committee, in any event. It has nothing to do with this bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. But it is offered as an amendment to this bill, and because it is offered as an amendment, the Senate will have to give it consideration and vote it up or down.

I am sure that the Senator would not want to consider the amendment lightly, and that he would agree that it should be given due consideration. I do not know what the situation is. If the Foreign Relations Committee is prepared to make presentations with regard to this amendment, we can go ahead. However, some Senators are anxious to get home. If it is going to require an hour and a half or 2 hours, and then we shall not be through with it, I think we should suspend at this point.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I think I have the floor.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me?

Mr. KILGORE. Just a moment, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has made the statement that the Judiciary has the power to handle the salary question as it sees fit. If the civil service classified group were to relinquish the deputy marshals and practically all except those who are appointed by the judges, or appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, I think we could go ahead. Deputy United States marshals are under the civil service classification with respect to pay. The civil service requirements must be satisfied before an employee's pay is increased. Why should we make fish of one and fowl of the other?

The same thing applies, may I say to the Senator from Connecticut, to employees in the Foreign Service, and employees of the State Department. I am becoming rather tired of the business of competitive or piecemeal raising of salaries, with the idea that just because a

person is employed in one department he should not be accorded the same treatment which is accorded to the employees of another department of Government.

It is the purpose in offering this amendment to take care of these employees under the general pay raise bill.

I think the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] feels the same way with reference to employees in the State Department. So long as we are going to put a rider in every bill that the salary of employees shall be subject to the classification of the civil service, I think we must take care of all of them, put them all in the same basket, so to speak, and treat them all alike.

I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator. I merely wish to say to the majority leader, if he will give me his attention for a moment, that I do not believe that the amendment which I have offered should be considered either controversial or difficult to deal with.

It merely provides that the Foreign Service officers shall get the same treatment as other civil-service employees. They were included in the House bill. As I understand, they were not included in the Senate bill because the committee felt that the amendment came under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. I may say that in our discussions we were wholly in accord with the purpose of the amendment. However, it was felt that it was beyond our jurisdiction. For that reason we did not consider it.

Mr. McMAHON. I may say that I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization of the State Department, and I presume that is why the Foreign Service officers have come to me with their problem. We have not taken it up in the Committee on Foreign Relations, because there has not been time to take it up. As everyone knows we have been engaged with very important problems, and are still so engaged with them. However, this is a matter of such patent fairness that it would seem to me that the amendment should be adopted and taken to conference.

I shall request the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], to accept the amendment. In fact, I do not believe I am divulging any secret when I say that I have discussed it with him and that he has stated he would take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina accept the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is not the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct.

The amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is the pending amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I earnestly request the majority leader to let the bill go over. It is a very important bill. Surely we want to be just as informed about it as we were on the postal bill, and we want to be fair to everyone and do all that is right. We cannot do it at 25 minutes after 6.

In the colloquy yesterday the majority leader referred to the fact that he hoped we would pass two bills. We have done so. In addition, we have approved two conference reports. Therefore, we could well go over until Monday, and then give this subject very careful consideration. I have the greatest respect for my friend, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. I know that being in charge of the bill he wants to get it passed if he can possibly do so. I hope he will withhold making his speech until Monday. I realize his anxiety, but I also realize that some Senators have gone home. Two bills have been passed. I earnestly request that the majority leader consider recessing at this time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in the afternoon, when I thought we would do well to finish the postal-pay bill today, I told some Senators that probably the Senate would recess after the postal bill was completed. Now an amendment affecting Canal Zone employees has been submitted to the bill at present under consideration. In the Canal Zone citizens are paid on a different basis than noncitizens. Various Senators have some questions in regard to that amendment. They wish to study it, and would like to have an opportunity to do so until Monday. If the amendment is to be pressed, I feel that the Senate should go over until Monday. Perhaps that would be the best thing to do under all the circumstances.

However, I want to assure everyone who is interested in the pending legislation that, inasmuch as the tax bill will not be ready until Wednesday, we shall proceed with the consideration of the pay-raise bill until we finish it on Monday.

I make that statement because some of the employees of the Federal Government have been afraid that if we pass the postal pay increase bill we may not pass the general pay increase bill, and I want to give assurance to everyone that we will take action on the classified employees pay raise. Of course I cannot speak for the Senate, and I should not speak for it, but putting the bill over until Monday does not mean that it is done for the purpose of defeating it.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. In that respect I agree with the distinguished Senator from Arizona, that it should not be done. It would be a sad commentary on the Senate if we took care of one segment of the Federal workers and not another.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say to the Senator from Rhode Island, from this side of the aisle, that after the unanimous vote this afternoon to in-

crease the salaries of one group of Federal employees, I do not see how we could avoid doing the same thing for the other group of employees. As acting minority leader I certainly hope that we shall do the same thing for the other employees.

Mr. McFARLAND. I know that putting the bill off until Monday will inconvenience some Senators who are very much interested in the proposed legislation, but they have told me that they would be here on Monday. I am confident we can give assurance to all Federal workers that they will be taken care of on Monday.

I wish to give notice that after the disposition of the pending bill, we shall take up Calendar 591, Senate bill 426, to provide for the separation of subsidy from air mail pay, and for other purposes.

I also wish to state that the tax bill will be taken up as soon as it is ready. I am informed that we will be ready to proceed with the consideration of the tax bill on Wednesday morning. It is our hope, with long sessions next week, to finish consideration of the bill some time on Saturday.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the sessions of the Senate next week, although it may not be necessary for me to be absent that long.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, September 17, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, September 14 (legislative day of September 13), 1951:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Christian M. Ravndal, of Iowa, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Uruguay, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Hungary, vice Nathaniel P. Davis, resigned.

Edward L. Roddan, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Uruguay.

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Floyd McAlister, College Heights, Ark. Office established December 1, 1949.

Luther D. Spurlock, Gould, Ark., in place of J. W. Paschall, retired.

Grover C. Lewers, Heth, Ark., in place of L. A. Steidley, retired.

William H. Hembree, Judsonia, Ark., in place of J. V. Huntley, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Ethel I. Maddix, Friant, Calif., in place of P. A. Bianchi, removed.

Peter M. Murray, Livermore, Calif., in place of W. R. McKinnon, retired.

Marie L. Maher, North Palm Springs, Calif. Office established February 16, 1950.

Adrian C. Firman, Puente, Calif., in place of Minnie Tyler, deceased.
 Carl T. Erickson, Sebastopol, Calif., in place of W. L. Benepe, retired.
 Fred B. Niswonger, Weed, Calif., in place of W. T. King, resigned.

COLORADO

Irma C. McAdoo, Breckenridge, Colo., in place of W. J. Murphy, retired.
 Glen V. Norton, Carbondale, Colo., in place of W. J. Pings, deceased.
 Lois M. Heyer, Gilman, Colo., in place of G. B. Bragg, resigned.
 Carl Eric Samuelson, Las Animas, Colo., in place of A. S. Dean, transferred.
 Leland Y. Cook, Springfield, Colo., in place of N. M. Finch, removed.

CONNECTICUT

Charles J. Calder, New Hartford, Conn., in place of M. S. Barboza, deceased.

FLORIDA

Frank M. Greene, Jr., Live Oak, Fla., in place of Wiley Bird, transferred.
 Robert Maurice O'Brien, Jr., Nichols, Fla., in place of R. M. O'Brien, resigned.

GEORGIA

Gretchen E. Chandler, Bowman, Ga., in place of F. M. Chandler, deceased.
 Montine M. Lowrey, Dacula, Ga., in place of A. L. Hinton, retired.
 Walter C. Marchant, Milan, Ga., in place of W. P. Cravey, transferred.
 Cloyd G. Blosser, Sparks, Ga., in place of A. V. Ethridge, retired.

IDAHO

Wilburn J. Adams, Rockland, Idaho, in place of A. L. Ralphs, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Mildred R. Leary, Byron, Ill., in place of H. V. Lynn, retired.
 Raymond T. Murphy, Chicago Heights, Ill., in place of D. P. Bergin, deceased.
 Kenneth W. Atkins, Lebanon, Ill., in place of E. C. F. Braun, retired.
 George C. Annasenz, Morton, Ill., in place of Levi Mosiman, resigned.
 George C. Bartholomew, Oswego, Ill., in place of Earl McVicker, transferred.
 Louis V. Keeley, Plainfield, Ill., in place of G. M. Lennon, retired.

INDIANA

Raymond Wittenmyer, Bloomington, Ind., in place of C. B. Webster, retired.
 Charles E. Kownover, Granger, Ind., in place of R. C. Walker, declined.

IOWA

Ralph E. Durfey, Aurora, Iowa, in place of Ruth Longenecker, resigned.
 Robert S. Hill, Ayrshire, Iowa, in place of K. A. Fagan, retired.
 Robert W. Lents, Bridgewater, Iowa, in place of K. R. McDermott, transferred.
 Lyle Barthel, Elkader, Iowa, in place of M. B. Bishop, retired.
 John F. Rechkemmer, Fairbank, Iowa, in place of J. B. Murphy, deceased.
 Emmet P. Kelly, Farley, Iowa, in place of W. A. Greenwood, deceased.
 Edward O. Koester, Hancock, Iowa, in place of M. E. Radford, retired.
 Philip J. Durnan, Ossian, Iowa, in place of T. F. Schmitz, retired.
 Carrie R. Newton, Stanzel, Iowa. Office established October 16, 1949.
 Edwin A. Hoch, Storm Lake, Iowa, in place of V. E. Herbert, retired.

KANSAS

Donald E. Ford, Leonardville, Kans., in place of L. A. Kopachek, retired.
 Verna B. Carter, Sawyer, Kans., in place of F. B. Kumberg, resigned.
 Gilbert E. Drake, Sedgwick, Kans., in place of R. D. Wiley, transferred.

KENTUCKY

Mary A. Copeland, Fern Creek, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1950.

Eugenia C. Lyttle, Manchester, Ky., in place of E. L. Lucas, resigned.
 Thomas C. Powell, Monticello, Ky., in place of W. M. Back, transferred.

LOUISIANA

Minnie B. Blount, Doyline, La., in place of A. D. Brown, retired.

MAINE

Conrad J. Lausier, Danforth, Maine, in place of J. G. Russell, retired.
 Alice I. M. Ewing, West Enfield, Maine, in place of J. R. Blanch, resigned.

MARYLAND

James A. Grove, Frederick, Md., in place of G. K. Motter, retired.
 William B. Gibson, Owings, Md., in place of H. O. Trott, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Joseph E. McCumber, Nutting Lake, Mass. Office established September 16, 1950.

MICHIGAN

Bernie J. Moorman, Barryton, Mich., in place of O. E. Farwell, transferred.
 Arthur R. Elzinga, Belding, Mich., in place of Lucille Ledger, resigned.
 Chester W. Silkworth, Brooklyn, Mich., in place of P. H. Totten, transferred.
 Percy H. McDonald, Richland, Mich., in place of H. V. Byard, resigned.
 Lloyd V. Preiss, Rockland, Mich., in place of C. J. Schmidlin, retired.
 Roy L. Wyckoff, Sheridan, Mich., in place of H. L. Stebbins, transferred.

MINNESOTA

Stella M. Madsen, Bethel, Minn., in place of J. W. Hart, transferred.
 Norbert V. Honer, Cold Spring, Minn., in place of H. P. Griffin, retired.
 Nestor C. Syblrud, Glenville, Minn., in place of C. H. Leighty, retired.
 Ernest W. Ipsen, Le Sueur, Minn., in place of Sam Doherty, deceased.
 Al Buse, Red Lake Falls, Minn., in place of R. A. Linnihan, deceased.
 Burt E. Walker, Stephen, Minn., in place of H. E. Hunter, deceased.

MISSISSIPPI

Marion F. Howard, Poplarville, Miss., in place of R. R. Smith, retired.
 Allie B. Collins, Vaiden, Miss., in place of W. W. Milner, deceased.

MISSOURI

Burl B. Nickell, Atlanta, Mo., in place of J. H. Hardgrove, retired.
 Clarence M. Shearer, Jr., Esther, Mo., in place of A. M. Hoy, retired.

NEBRASKA

Gertrude M. Wesierski, Ashton, Nebr., in place of L. L. Lewandowski, transferred.
 Delmer Vandewege, Firth, Nebr., in place of G. D. Young, transferred.
 Frederic J. Stevens, Hartington, Nebr., in place of C. J. Dendinger, transferred.

NEW YORK

John M. Quealy, Addison, N. Y., in place of J. M. O'Keefe, resigned.
 Milton S. Hubbard, Jefferson, N. Y., in place of J. W. Beggs, retired.
 Dora L. Walsh, Mellenville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.
 Mary I. Ward, Moravia, N. Y., in place of A. A. Morse, retired.
 Archibald G. McLellan, Ogdensburg, N. Y., in place of L. J. Ewart, deceased.
 Samuel J. Bertuzzi, Oneonta, N. Y., in place of C. A. Miller, retired.
 Victor Rowe, Ontario Center, N. Y., in place of M. C. Foley, retired.
 Walter G. Kluge, Orient, N. Y., in place of J. H. Douglass, retired.
 Peter J. Clark, Richland, N. Y., in place of A. D. Widrig, resigned.
 Paul B. Conley, Schenectady, N. Y., in place of F. C. Beams, transferred.

NORTH CAROLINA

Alfred W. Huff, Mars Hill, N. C., in place of F. H. Holcombe, resigned.
 Daisy Holthouser, Mocksville, N. C., in place of J. P. LeGrand, transferred.

NORTH DAKOTA

LeRoy A. Anderson, Binford, N. Dak., in place of J. A. Knapp, retired.
 Mattie J. Clapper, Glenburn, N. Dak., in place of N. V. Simmons, transferred.
 Donald Smith, Souris, N. Dak., in place of A. M. Sletten, transferred.

OHIO

Thomas H. Dearth, Londonderry, Ohio, in place of R. C. Scott, resigned.
 Ray Edward Bayer, Perrysburg, Ohio, in place of G. J. Munger, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Maynard E. Shelite, Freedom, Okla., in place of J. R. Whittet, retired.

OREGON

James E. Schuetze, Lafayette, Oreg., in place of W. G. Courtney, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Helen M. Smith, Blairsville, Pa., in place of L. P. McGillick, retired.
 Gladys K. David, Bryn Athyn, Pa., in place of J. R. Clayton, retired.
 Richard Downing, Jr., Conneaut Lake Park, Pa., in place of H. W. McArthur, deceased.
 Clyde M. Buzard, Ellwood City, Pa., in place of T. A. Wilson, retired.
 Beatrice M. Fitzstephens, Genesee, Pa., in place of D. M. Sullivan, retired.
 Frank H. Keller, Linden, Pa., in place of W. D. Anderson, transferred.
 Olga T. Graham, Russellton, Pa., in place of D. D. Salomon, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA

William H. Woods, White Hall, S. C., in place of Blanche Sloman, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Burdette W. P. Oakley, Mount Vernon, S. Dak., in place of G. W. Lawrence, retired.
 Harvey J. Hullinger, Vivian, S. Dak., in place of J. V. Heath, transferred.

TENNESSEE

Calvin L. Draffin, Atoka, Tenn., in place of E. M. Quisenberry, retired.
 William T. Vaughn, Paris, Tenn., in place of H. V. Somerville, deceased.

TEXAS

Travis G. Keeling, Avery, Tex., in place of W. G. Bryan, retired.
 Walter R. Fitch, Bedford, Tex. Office established June 1, 1950.
 Willie R. Peacock, Bivins, Tex., in place of G. B. Morse, resigned.
 Ur D. Kindrick, Junction, Tex., in place of H. G. Hubert, retired.
 Adolph C. Mestayer, Lone Star, Tex. Office established May 1, 1948.
 Rex L. Harris, Marietta, Tex., in place of W. A. Harty, retired.
 Grady W. Henly, New Deal, Tex. Office established June 1, 1949.

UTAH

Joseph P. Dillier, Kearns, Utah. Office established September 1, 1950.

WASHINGTON

Anthony C. Klotz, Burien, Wash., in place of M. R. Clothier, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Edith M. Holmes, Masontown, W. Va., in place of B. E. Hall, resigned.
 Clyde J. Cornett, Northfork, W. Va., in place of W. S. Wray, retired.
 Nell W. Marshall, Pageton, W. Va., in place of O. S. Conner, retired.
 Theodore P. Latos, Windsor Heights, W. Va., in place of E. M. Griffith, retired.

WISCONSIN

Joseph D. Robertson, De Soto, Wis., in place of C. K. Hammond, transferred.

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 622

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

SEPTEMBER 17 (legislative day, SEPTEMBER 13), 1951

Ordered to be printed as passed by the Senate

AN ACT

To increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
- 2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
- 3 That (a) sections 603 (b) and 603 (c) of the Classification
- 4 Act of 1949, approved October 28, 1949, as amended, are
- 5 hereby amended to read as follows:

1 “(b) The compensation schedule for the general
2 schedule shall be as follows:

Grade	Per annum rates						
GS-1.....	\$2,420	\$2,500	\$2,580	\$2,660	\$2,740	\$2,820	\$2,900
GS-2.....	2,695	2,775	2,855	2,935	3,015	3,095	3,175
GS-3.....	2,915	2,995	3,075	3,155	3,235	3,315	3,395
GS-4.....	3,160	3,240	3,320	3,400	3,480	3,560	3,640
GS-5.....	3,410	3,535	3,660	3,785	3,910	4,035	4,160
GS-6.....	3,795	3,920	4,045	4,170	4,295	4,420	4,545
GS-7.....	4,205	4,330	4,455	4,580	4,705	4,830	4,955
GS-8.....	4,620	4,745	4,870	4,995	5,120	5,245	5,370
GS-9.....	5,060	5,185	5,310	5,435	5,560	5,685	5,810
GS-10.....	5,500	5,625	5,750	5,875	6,000	6,125	6,250
GS-11.....	5,940	6,140	6,340	6,540	6,740	6,940	
GS-12.....	7,040	7,240	7,440	7,640	7,840	8,040	
GS-13.....	8,360	8,560	8,760	8,960	9,160	9,360	
GS-14.....	9,600	9,800	10,000	10,200	10,400	10,600	
GS-15.....	10,800	11,050	11,300	11,550	11,800		
GS-16.....	12,000	12,200	12,400	12,600	12,800		
GS-17.....	13,000	13,200	13,400	13,600	13,800		
GS-18.....	14,800						

3 (c) (1) The compensation schedule for the crafts,
4 protective, and custodial schedule shall be as follows:

CPC-1.....	\$1,660	\$1,720	\$1,780	\$1,840	\$1,900	\$1,960	\$2,020
CPC-2.....	2,330	2,400	2,470	2,540	2,610	2,680	2,750
CPC-3.....	2,475	2,555	2,635	2,715	2,795	2,875	2,955
CPC-4.....	2,695	2,775	2,855	2,935	3,015	3,095	3,175
CPC-5.....	2,940	3,020	3,100	3,180	3,260	3,340	3,420
CPC-6.....	3,190	3,270	3,350	3,430	3,510	3,590	3,670
CPC-7.....	3,435	3,535	3,635	3,735	3,835	3,935	4,035
CPC-8.....	3,740	3,865	3,990	4,115	4,240	4,365	4,490
CPC-9.....	4,150	4,275	4,400	4,525	4,650	4,775	4,900
CPC-10.....	4,565	4,690	4,815	4,940	5,065	5,190	5,315

5 “(2) Charwomen working part time shall be paid at
6 the rate of \$2,610 per annum, and head charwomen working
7 part time at the rate of \$2,750 per annum.”

8 (b) In adjusting initially the rates of pay of employees
9 affected by the provisions of this section—

10 (1) an employee receiving basic compensation im-
11 mediately prior to the effective date of this Act at one of
12 the scheduled or longevity rates provided by the Classifi-
13 cation Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive basic
14 compensation on and after the effective date of this Act

1 at the corresponding scheduled or longevity rate as
2 increased by this Act; and

3 (2) an employee receiving basic compensation im-
4 mediately prior to the effective date of this Act at a rate
5 other than a scheduled or longevity rate provided by the
6 Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive
7 basic compensation on and after the effective date of this
8 Act as follows:

9 (A) If his rate immediately prior to the effec-
10 tive date of this Act was less than the maximum
11 longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at the
12 scheduled or longevity rate which he would receive
13 under paragraph (1) had he been receiving basic
14 compensation immediately prior to such effective
15 date at the scheduled or longevity rate next higher
16 than his rate of basic compensation immediately
17 prior to such effective date.

18 (B) If his rate immediately prior to the effec-
19 tive date of this Act was in excess of the maximum
20 longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at a rate
21 equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately
22 prior to such date, increased by an amount equal to
23 the amount of the increase made by this Act in such
24 maximum longevity rate.

1 (C) If he is a part-time char employee and his
2 rate immediately prior to the effective date of this
3 Act was in excess of the rate provided for his position
4 under section 603 (c) (2) of the Classification
5 Act of 1949, as amended, he shall be paid at a rate
6 equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately
7 prior to such effective date, increased by an amount
8 equal to the amount of the increase made by this
9 Act in the rate for like positions under such section.

10 (c) (1) The rates of basic compensation of officers
11 and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Govern-
12 ment whose rates of compensation are fixed pursuant to sec-
13 tion 62 (2) of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C. 102 (a)
14 (2)), section 3656 of title 18 of the United States Code, the
15 second and third sentences of section 603, section 604 (5),
16 or sections 671 to 675, inclusive, of title 28 of the United
17 States Code, or who are appointed pursuant to section
18 792. (b) of title 28 of the United States Code, are hereby
19 increased by amounts equal to the increases provided by
20 subsections (a) and (b) in corresponding rates of compensa-
21 tion paid to officers and employees subject to the Classifica-
22 tion Act of 1949.

23 (d) The limitations of \$9,600 and \$13,050 with respect
24 to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks
25 of circuit and district judges, contained in the sixteenth para-

graph under the head "Miscellaneous salaries" in the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 759, Eighty-first Congress), or in any subsequent appropriation Act, shall be increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this Act.

(e) The increase in existing rates of basic compensation provided by this Act shall not be construed to be an equivalent increase in compensation within the meaning of section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

SEC. 2. (a) Each officer or employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government (other than an employee in the office of a Senator) whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of (1) 8.8 per centum of the aggregate rate of his basic compensation and the rate of the additional compensation received by him under sections 501 and 502 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, section 301 of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and the provisions under the heading "Increased pay for legislative employees" in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, or (2) \$800 per annum, whichever is the lesser.

(b) The provisions of section 603 (b) of the Federal

1 Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, section 7 (b)
2 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, as amended,
3 section 303 (c) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal
4 Employees Salary Act of 1948, and the provisions of para-
5 graph (b) under the heading "Increased pay for legislative
6 employees" in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act,
7 1950, shall not apply to officers or employees subject to the
8 provisions of subsection (a) or to employees in the offices of
9 Senators, but no officer or employee of the Senate or House
10 of Representatives shall be paid with respect to any pay
11 period basic compensation or basic compensation plus addi-
12 tional compensation at a rate in excess of \$11,646 per annum
13 unless expressly authorized by law.

14 (c) (1) The aggregate amount of the basic compensa-
15 tion authorized to be paid for administrative and clerical
16 assistance and messenger service in the offices of Senators
17 is hereby increased by—

18 (A) \$3,540 in the case of Senators from States the
19 population of which is less than three million;

20 (B) \$3,720 in the case of Senators from States the
21 population of which is three million or more but less than
22 five million;

23 (C) \$4,260 in the case of Senators from States the
24 population of which is five million or more but less than
25 ten million; and

(D) \$4,440 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is ten million or more.

(2) The second proviso in the paragraph relating to the authority of Senators to rearrange the basic salaries of employees in their respective offices, which appears in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, as amended (2 U. S. C. 60f), is amended by striking out "\$5,280" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$5,820"; and by striking out "\$6,720" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$7,320".

(d) The Legislative Branch Appropriation Act is amended by striking out, in the paragraph designated "Folding documents" under the heading "Contingent expenses of the Senate" the words "\$1 per thousand" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2 per thousand". The provisions of subsection (a), and the provisions of law referred to in such subsection, shall not apply to employees whose compensation is paid from the appropriation contained in such paragraph.

(e) The rate of basic compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives (not including the presiding officers of the two Houses), and of the legislative counsel of the Senate and the legislative counsel of the House of Representatives, are hereby increased by 8.8 per centum or \$800 per annum, whichever is the lesser.

SEC. 3. (a) The annual compensation (including basic salary and additional compensation in lieu of overtime pay

1 and night pay differential) of each officer and member of the
2 Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the
3 White House Police, and the Fire Department of the Dis-
4 trict of Columbia, as increased by the Act entitled "An Act
5 to provide for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan
6 Police, the United States Park Police, the White House
7 Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the
8 District of Columbia, to conform with the increased cost of
9 living in the District of Columbia", approved July 14, 1945,
10 as amended, and by the Act entitled "An Act to increase the
11 compensation of certain employees of the municipal govern-
12 ment of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes",
13 approved June 30, 1949, shall be further increased by 10
14 per centum or \$800, whichever is the lesser. The proviso
15 contained in the first sentence of the first section of said Act
16 of June 30, 1949, is hereby repealed; but no officer or
17 member covered by this section shall, by reason of the
18 enactment of this section, be paid with respect to any pay
19 period, basic salary, or basic salary plus additional com-
20 pensation at a rate in excess of \$11,130 per annum.

21 (b) (1) Each employee of the Board of Education of
22 the District of Columbia whose salary is fixed and regulated
23 by the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947,
24 except the Superintendent of Schools, shall receive, in addi-
25 tion to the compensation already provided by such Act and

1 by the Act of June 30, 1949, compensation at the rate of 10
2 per centum of the aggregate compensation provided by said
3 Acts, or \$800 per annum, whichever is the lesser.

4 (2) The basic and maximum salaries for all salary
5 classes in title I of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary
6 Act of 1947, except class 29, are hereby increased by 10
7 per centum or \$800, whichever is the lesser.

8 (c) Section 66 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (48
9 Stat. 269) is hereby amended to read as follows:

10 "SEC. 66. No director, officer, or employee of the Central
11 Bank for Cooperatives, or of any production credit corpora-
12 tion, production credit association, or bank for cooperatives
13 shall be paid compensation at a rate in excess of \$13,800 per
14 annum."

15 (d) (1) Hereafter, Foreign Service officers, including
16 the class of career minister, and Foreign Service staff officers
17 and employees, shall be compensated in accordance with the
18 compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as
19 amended and supplemented.

20 (2) Sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act
21 of 1946, as amended, and all other provisions of such Act
22 which are inconsistent with the Classification Act of 1949,
23 as amended, are hereby repealed.

24 (3) Section 202 (2) of the Classification Act of 1949.
25 as amended, is hereby repealed.

1 (4) The compensation of any Foreign Service officer
2 or Foreign Service staff officer or employee who is an officer
3 or employee of the United States on the effective date of this
4 amendment shall not be reduced by reason of the provisions
5 of this amendment; but when any such position becomes
6 vacant any new appointee shall be compensated in accord-
7 ance with the compensation schedules of, and regulations
8 issued by the Civil Service Commission under, the Classifica-
9 tion Act of 1949, as amended.

10 (e) The rate of basic compensation for physicians, den-
11 tists, nurses, and other employees in the Department of
12 Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration whose
13 rates of basic compensation are provided by Public Law
14 293, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved January 3, 1946, as
15 amended, are hereby increased 10 per centum or \$800 per
16 annum, whichever is the lesser.

17 SEC. 4. This Act shall become effective on the first day
18 of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1951.

Passed the Senate September 17 (legislative day,
September 13), 1951.

Attest:

LESLIE L. BIFFLE,

Secretary.

AN ACT

To increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

SEPTEMBER 17 (legislative day, SEPTEMBER 13), 1951

Ordered to be printed as passed by the Senate

S. 622

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

SEPTEMBER 14 (legislative day, SEPTEMBER 13), 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. McMAHON to the bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, viz:

1 On page 7, line 19, insert the following:

2 “SEC. 3. Each of the rates of basic compensation pro-
3 vided by sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act
4 of 1946 (Public Law 724, Seventy-ninth Congress), as
5 amended, is hereby increased by (1) 8.8 per centum, or
6 (2) \$800 per annum, whichever is the lesser.”

7 On page 7, line 20, change: “SEC. 3.” to “SEC. 4.”

82d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 622

AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. McMAHON to the bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

SEPTEMBER 14 (legislative day, SEPTEMBER 13), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

S. 622

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

SEPTEMBER 14 (legislative day, SEPTEMBER 13), 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. UNDERWOOD to the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. NEELY to the bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, viz:

1 On page 2, after section 3 (b) (2), add the following
2 paragraph:

3 (c) Section 66 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (48
4 Stat. 269) is hereby amended to read as follows:

5 “SEC. 66. No director, officer, or employee of the Central
6 Bank for Cooperatives, or of any production credit corpora-
7 tion, production credit association, or bank for cooperatives
8 shall be paid compensation at a rate in excess of \$13,800
9 per annum.”

82d CONGRESS
1st Session

S. 622

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. UNDERWOOD to the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. NEELY to the bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

SEPTEMBER 14 (legislative day, SEPTEMBER 13), 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

S. 622

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

SEPTEMBER 13, 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. NEELY to the bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, viz: On page 7, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

1 SEC. 3. (a) The annual compensation (including basic
2 salary and additional compensation in lieu of overtime pay
3 and night pay differential) of each officer and member of the
4 Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the
5 White House Police, and the Fire Department of the Dis-
6 trict of Columbia, as increased by the Act entitled "An Act
7 to provide for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan
8 Police, the United States Park Police, the White House
9 Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the
10 District of Columbia, to conform with the increased cost of

1 living in the District of Columbia", approved July 14, 1945,
2 as amended, and by the Act entitled "An Act to increase the
3 compensation of certain employees of the municipal govern-
4 ment of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes",
5 approved June 30, 1949, shall be further increased by 8.8
6 per centum or \$800, whichever is the lesser. The proviso
7 contained in the first sentence of the first section of said Act
8 of June 30, 1949, is hereby repealed; but no officer or
9 member covered by this section shall, by reason of the
10 enactment of this section, be paid with respect to any pay
11 period, basic salary, or basic salary plus additional com-
12 pensation at a rate in excess of \$11,130 per annum.

13 (b) (1) Each employee of the Board of Education of
14 the District of Columbia whose salary is fixed and regulated
15 by the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947,
16 except the Superintendent of Schools, shall receive, in addi-
17 tion to the compensation already provided by such Act and
18 by the Act of June 30, 1949, compensation at the rate of 8.8
19 per centum of the aggregate compensation provided by said
20 Acts, or \$800 per annum, whichever is the lesser.

21 (2) The basic and maximum salaries for all salary
22 classes in title I of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary
23 Act of 1947, except class 29, are hereby increased by 8.8
24 per centum or \$800, whichever is the lesser.

82^d CONGRESS
1ST Session

S. 622

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. NEELY to the bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

SEPTEMBER 13, 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82^d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 97

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1951

No. 172

Senate

(Legislative day of Thursday, September 13, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, whose mercies are new every morning, at this daily shrine of our spirits hallowed for us by a special sense of Thy presence, we would lift up our souls to Thee. Even as evil rages at its worst and deluded people imagine vain things, strengthen our trust in the eternal goodness. All beauty is Thine, the loveliness on the face of nature and the beauty hidden in the heart of man.

Deliver us this day from ugliness in thought and speech and conduct. May ours be a goodness that is set aflame with moral indignation at blatant betrayals of trust, endangering the very perpetuity of the Republic. Give us a new sense of our national destiny and the calm assurance that in all the shouting and tumult of these disordered days Thy truth is marching on. We ask it in the name of that One who is the truth and the life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, September 14, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1005) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 608. An act for the relief of Kiyoko Matsuo; and

H. R. 1971. An act for the relief of Kirocor Haladjian, Tacouhi Haladjian, Gulunia Haladjian, and Virginie Haladjian.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CHAVEZ, on behalf of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

PAY INCREASES FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

REQUEST TO EXPUNGE STATEMENT FROM THE APPENDIX OF THE RECORD

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the approval of the RECORD be suspended until I have a chance to present a matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate does not approve the RECORD. It only approves the Journal. There is nothing in the Journal about the matter concerning which the Senator wishes to correct the RECORD.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. When is the proper time at which the Senator from Florida can make a motion or ask for unanimous consent to expunge from the RECORD a matter which had not occurred in the Senate and had no proper place in the RECORD?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can make a unanimous-consent request at any time.

TESTIMONY BY WILLIAM M. BOYLE, JR.— LETTER FROM ATTORNEY GENERAL McGRATH

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, during the session last Friday the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] called attention to what appeared to be a discrepancy between the testimony before a Senate committee of William M. Boyle, Jr., and the book Democracy at Work.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As acting minority leader, I should like to send for the Senator from Maine if the Senator from Arizona is going to make a statement.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am not going to make a statement. I am merely asking permission to make an insertion in the RECORD.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Very well.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, after that statement on Friday, I called Hon. J. Howard McGrath, present Attorney General of the United States, who was chairman of the Democratic National Committee during the period in question, to determine what the true facts were, and asked him to write a letter explaining the situation. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the letter which I received from him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Certainly, far be it from me to object to a unanimous-consent request of that character made by the majority leader. I think perhaps the Senator from Maine should have the opportunity of reading the letter or discussing it with the majority leader before it is put in the RECORD, if it is in conflict with the statement which the Senator from Maine made on the floor. That is my only request.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no objection to the Senator from Maine being present when the request is made. I myself have no knowledge of the facts. All I asked was for insertion in the RECORD of a letter which explains the facts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Perhaps the Senator from Maine would like to comment on the letter, because she has made a very factual statement. I simply want to give her the opportunity to be present, or at least to read the letter, in order to comment on it at the time the request for insertion in the RECORD is made.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is perfectly satisfactory. But I would call the Senator's attention to the fact that the only thing the letter does is explain that the book from which she quoted was published after Mr. Boyle's appointment, although it purported to cover a period previous to that time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If that is all the letter states then I shall not object, if the Senator wants to put it in the RECORD. I hope he will give the Senator from Maine an opportunity to make a statement in connection with it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understood the distinguished Senator from Maine has been sent a copy of the letter. I have no objection to her being on the floor at the time I make the request. As I stated, I have no personal knowledge of the facts. All I am interested in is that the true factual situation be available. Mr. McGrath's letter explains that the book was published after Mr. Boyle's appointment. If the Senator from Maine wants to make any comment upon it or if the Senator wants me to wait, I will do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If perhaps the Senator from Florida is going to make his statement in the meantime, I will get in touch with the Senator from Maine.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to suggest the absence of a quorum anyway, and I will wait until after the quorum call to make my request.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the majority leader very much.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator make the point of no quorum?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McFarland
Bennett	Hayden	McKellar
Benton	Hendrickson	McMahon
Bricker	Hennings	Millikin
Bridges	Hill	Monroney
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Moody
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Morse
Cain	Humphrey	Mundt
Capehart	Hunt	Murray
Carlson	Ives	Neely
Case	Johnson, Colo.	O'Connor
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Connally	Kem	Robertson
Cordon	Kerr	Russell
Douglas	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Duff	Knowland	Schoeppel
Dworshak	Langer	Smathers
Eastland	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Eaton	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Ellender	Long	Taft
Ferguson	Malone	Underwood
Flanders	Martin	Watkins
Frear	Maybank	Welker
Fulbright	McCarran	Williams
George	McCarthy	Young
Gillette	McClellan	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KE-

FAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator From New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOLLAND—ITEM EXPUNGED FROM THE APPENDIX—RULE GOVERNING PRINTING IN THE RECORD

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, about 4:30 o'clock p. m. on Saturday afternoon, I received a call from a member of the press stating that he had received inquiries from various newspapers in Tennessee relative to an article which he said I had inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD during Friday's session of the Senate. Since I had inserted no article in the RECORD on that date, I was, of course, surprised.

On checking I found that there was an article carried at page A5873 in the Appendix of the RECORD for Friday, September 14, not only purporting to have been inserted by the senior Senator from Florida, but also quoting the senior Senator from Florida in a statement which purported to express a request made by him of the Senate for unanimous consent to include the statement which had been printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, of course, I had made no such request. No such request had been granted. No such article should have been printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I so informed the press.

Thereupon the press suggested that in order to get the matter entirely clear, a formal written press notice on the subject might well be issued by me. I immediately dictated such a statement, and released it late Saturday afternoon, September 15. I shall read that press release into the RECORD at this time, because I think it rather clearly sets forth what happened:

PRESS RELEASE BY SENATOR SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, SEPTEMBER 15, 1951

I have been astounded to see in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday, September 14, at page A5873, what purports to be an extension of remarks by me in which I am quoted as having asked the Senate for unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Fuller Warren describing the book *Crime in America*, issued under the name of the junior Senator from Tennessee, Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER.

Following said purported statement by me, there appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

an article entitled "Statement by Fuller Warren" which makes several uncomplimentary references to Senator KEFAUVER.

Since I have very high respect for Senator KEFAUVER and would not have even thought of doing anything of this sort, which would have been obviously most unfriendly to him, I want to make it completely clear that (1) I did not ask for consent to insert this article in the RECORD, (2) the Senate did not grant such consent, and (3) said article should never have been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article, in mimeographed form, was handed to me by Hon. Leslie Biffle, Secretary of the Senate, for my information, during the session of the Senate yesterday. After reading the article I looked several times for Mr. Biffle, intending to return it to him, but failed to find him. As I was leaving the Senate Chamber after the end of the session, I again thought of the article and handed it to a page with instructions to deliver it to Mr. Biffle, whose office is nearby the Senate Chamber. The page evidently misunderstood me and delivered the article to someone on the staff of the Official Senate Reporter, who in turn must have gotten the mistaken idea that the article was intended for insertion in the RECORD. It was, of course, wholly improper for anyone to have ascribed to me the words in which I was quoted as asking for consent to insert the article in the RECORD. As already stated, I did not speak such words or make any statement or request whatever to the Senate relating to the article.

Of course, I deeply regret the fact that I am misquoted, as just stated, and the fact that the article appears in the RECORD, and I shall ask the Senate on Monday to expunge the entire matter from the RECORD, since no such incident occurred.

Mr. President, I note that in addition to the quotation in the Appendix of the RECORD which I have just mentioned there is a brief and erroneous reference in the body of the RECORD to the effect that I made such a request.

I ask unanimous consent at this time that both the brief reference in the body of the RECORD and the entire treatment of the matter in the Appendix of the RECORD be expunged from the permanent RECORD, as something which never occurred and should not be shown in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have just been handed a statement by Mr. John D. Rhodes, one of the reporters of debates of the Senate, which I ask leave also to incorporate in the body of the RECORD at this time, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN D. RHODES, OFFICIAL REPORTER OF DEBATES, UNITED STATES SENATE

There is found in the back of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD each day what is called the Appendix, containing anywhere from 4 to 5 to 40 or more matters not having to do with the pending debate, like newspaper articles, editorials, speeches made elsewhere than in the Senate, magazine articles, and the like.

At times Senators desiring the insertion of such matters in the Appendix rise in the Senate and ask unanimous consent that the insertions be made. But when a debate is in progress, in order not to interrupt or take up time, they bring the material to the desk and leave it for insertion.

In the latter cases, if the Senator has not written two or three lines indicating the na-

hour-to-hour demands of the committee work, and I therefore asked Mr. Boyle to serve on a full-time salary basis. It was obvious to both Mr. Boyle and myself, based on our mutual experiences at the committee, that the work of the committee was such as to require the full-time services of an executive vice chairman.

Thus, you will see that Mr. Boyle held no official title or position with the Democratic National Committee until February 8, 1949, and that he received no salary from the committee until April 20, 1949; that he was, contrary to Senator SMITH's charge, exactly what he declared himself to be during the 1948 campaign, a volunteer worker.

The book to which Senator SMITH referred, *Democracy at Work*, was not published until late March 1949, at which time the authors saw fit to include as many photographs as seemed appropriate to fit the volume. Thus, Mr. Boyle's photograph appears therein under the title executive vice chairman, which title he had held only from February 8, 1949, but which he did not hold during the 1948 campaign.

Mr. Boyle further testified before the subcommittee that Merl Young was, during the 1948 campaign, a volunteer worker at the party's Washington headquarters. This is a correct statement. However, I wish to point out that at no time did Mr. Young hold any official, or even a staff, position with the national committee during the time that I was chairman, which was from October 29, 1947, to August 24, 1949.

All of the facts that I have here stated are supported by the public releases to the press from the Democratic National Committee, and can be further authenticated, in the files of most newspapers.

Very sincerely yours,

J. HOWARD McGRATH.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question on another subject?

Mr. McFARLAND. If I may first conclude, I shall then be happy to yield. The press release, which I also wish to read into the RECORD, was issued by the publicity division of the Democratic National Committee for immediate release on the 8th day of February 1949. I read:

William M. Boyle, Jr., today was named executive vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee to permit Senator J. Howard McGrath, chairman of the committee, to be free of administrative details in order to devote more time to his Senate duties.

Senator McGrath announced the appointment of Boyle, who helped to plan President Truman's campaign tours as an assistant to McGrath, after the two had visited with President Truman.

Boyle has previously served the President as assistant counsel to the War Investigating Committee when it was headed by the then Senator Truman, and as his executive assistant and secretary.

Boyle served as the Democratic National Committee in 1944 as an assistant to Robert E. Hannegan, when Hannegan was national chairman.

Boyle, 46, was born at Leavenworth, Kans., but moved to Kansas City as a boy. He attended to Westport High School in Kansas City, Kansas City Junior College, Georgetown University, in Washington, and was graduated from the Kansas City School of Law in 1926 and admitted to the Missouri bar in that year.

He was active in Kansas City political life and after serving as secretary to the director of police he later became director of police and also served as an assistant prosecutor.

In 1941 he came to Washington to take his post with the Truman Committee.

He is married to the former Genevieve C. Hayde and they have two children, Jean Marie, 18, a student at Chevy Chase Junior College, and Barbara Ann, 16, a student at the Holy Cross Academy. The family lives at 2924 Upton NW., and Boyle's law office is at 1029 Vermont Avenue NW.

Mr. President, I do not think the remainder is very material, but there is also included a clipping from the New York Times of February 9, 1949, with the news story of Mr. Boyle's appointment, and also a copy of a press release dated April 20, 1949, announcing the appointment of Mr. Boyle as executive vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and I ask that these be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the news article and the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN GIVES POST TO CAMPAIGN AIDE—W. M. BOYLE, STRATEGIST FOR PRE-ELECTION TRAIN TOURS, WILL JOIN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

(By Anthony Leviero)

WASHINGTON, February 8.—President Truman sanctioned today the appointment of William M. Boyle, Jr., of Kansas City, one of the leading strategists of his political campaign, as executive vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

The appointment was announced at the White House by Senator J. Howard McGrath, chairman of the committee, after a conference with the President. Mr. Boyle also was present.

Mr. McGrath said that Mr. Boyle would be chiefly responsible for the administrative operation of the National Democratic headquarters but would also share in the policy making. The Senator explained that this relief from the administrative burden would allow him to give most of his time to his senatorial duties, which had increased with the Democratic election victory.

The appointment placed in a key party position an intimate of the President who, like Mr. Truman, was a product of the Pendergast political machine in Kansas City. But, like the President, Mr. Boyle has never been touched by the scandals of the Tom Pendergast era.

TRUMAN IN "HEARTY ACCORD"

"The President is in hearty accord with the plan," said Senator McGrath, in making the announcement.

Mr. Boyle, who is now a lawyer here, will serve without pay. While his main role will be one of day-to-day management, it was also said in informed quarters that he would be the big political power in passing on patronage.

This was not expected to embrace all high-level appointments like Cabinet posts and the most important ambassadorships, but it was believed that patronage claims from the State and other local party organizations would be scanned by him.

Mr. Boyle, who is 46 years old, is credited with advising Mr. Truman to make the whistle stops in what proved to be the decisive areas of Ohio and southern Illinois against the advice of some other Democratic chieftains.

He is also credited with devising in detail Mr. Truman's 31,000-mile campaign itinerary and, above that, in sensing the psychological timing of the Chief Executive's appearances for maximum effect.

The White House conference, it was understood, also made it assured that John M. Redding would continue as publicity director of the national committee. Involved in the appointment is a plan to tighten up the headquarters organization and to define the missions of what are now four loosely coordinated divisions—women's publicity, treasurer's, and politics.

No important personnel changes are involved, but the committee will soon have to select a national treasurer to fill the vacancy caused by the recent death of Joe L. Blythe, of Charlotte, N. C.

Effective immediately, William M. Boyle, Jr., will assume full-time duties on a salary basis at the Democratic National Committee as executive vice chairman, Senator J. Howard McGrath, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, announced today.

In making the announcement, Senator McGrath said:

"I am pleased to say that Bill Boyle will from now on give his full attention to the task of directing the day-to-day operations of the Democratic National Committee. This move is a logical development arising from the constantly increasing responsibilities which have been assigned to Mr. Boyle and which have begun to consume his entire time and attention.

"Mr. Boyle's acceptance of these duties is appreciated by both the committee and the Democratic Party."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the first paragraph of the news item which appeared in the New York Times of February 9, 1949. I shall read merely the first paragraph:

TRUMAN GIVES POST TO CAMPAIGN AIDE, W. M. BOYLE—STRATEGIST FOR PRE-ELECTION TRAIN TOURS WILL JOIN NATIONAL PARTY

WASHINGTON, February 8.—President Truman announced the appointment of William M. Boyle, Jr., of Kansas City, one of the leading strategists of the political campaign, as executive vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee. The appointment was announced at the White House by Senator J. Howard McGrath, chairman of the committee, after a conference with the President. Mr. Boyle was also present.

I have also before me copy of a press release dated March 30, 1949, issued by the local Democratic political committee of Pennsylvania, which I understand was largely responsible for the compilation and publication of the volume *Democracy at Work*. I shall not ask that it appear in the RECORD, but I note that the release makes clear that the volume was to sell for from \$5 to \$10 a copy, and that it was compiled and edited under the auspices of a local Democratic political committee in Pennsylvania and is not an official publication of the national committee.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine subsequently said: Mr. President, tomorrow the junior Senator from Maine will reply to the letter from Hon. J. Howard McGrath inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today by the majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Arizona stated on Friday that the order of business would be the bill which is now pending before the Senate, which concerns the compensation of certain Government officers and employees, af-

ter which he proposes to move to the consideration of Senate bill 436 relating to the separation of subsidy from airmail pay. Can the Senator give us any indication of when he expects the tax bill to be taken up by the Senate for consideration? I understand there may be some change in plans.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am informed, and I have no information to the contrary, that the tax bill will come up for consideration on Wednesday, next.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. On Wednesday?

Mr. McFARLAND. On Wednesday.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is the Senator likely to move to call the calendar of unobjected-to bills, in the event the two bills I have mentioned are finished early tomorrow afternoon?

Mr. McFARLAND. I had thought I would ask unanimous consent to call the calendar between now and next Wednesday morning, and as soon as we know definitely about when we shall be able to dispose of the airmail pay-subsidy separation bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona permit me to ask a question of the Senator from New Jersey, whether that would be agreeable to the calendar committee representing the minority group?

Mr. McFARLAND. Before the Senator does that, I had intended to consult with the Senator from New Jersey before making the announcement. I want that to be clear.

Mr. HENRICKSON. The Senator from Arizona referred to "next Wednesday morning." Did the Senator mean Wednesday of this week, or Wednesday of next week?

Mr. McFARLAND. I meant the coming Wednesday.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would be sometime Wednesday, would it?

Mr. McFARLAND. It would be sometime tomorrow, if we get through with this bill and the air-subsidy bill in time.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. It would be quite satisfactory to have the calendar called on Thursday.

Mr. McFARLAND. I would not want the call of the calendar to interfere or affect the consideration by the Senate of the tax bill. I would rather have the calendar go over than do that. Could the Senator be ready tomorrow?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I doubt very much whether the Republican calendar committee could be ready by tomorrow; but we can try.

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall certainly consult the Senator later on, to determine whether he could be ready at that time.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will permit, I should like to ask one other question, in the interest of the minority. The question is as to what bill might be taken up if the tax bill were not ready, or what bills might be taken up after the tax bill shall have been disposed of.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should prefer to answer that question later in the day, or

tomorrow. I would want to find out how much delay there might be, before announcing what bill would be taken up.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So that, if consideration of these two bills is concluded, the session might be fairly short, unless there were a call of the calendar. Is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is true, unless we could find another bill which would not take very long.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

PAY INCREASES FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may the amendment be again stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment again for the benefit of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, between lines 18 and 19, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

(c) (1) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed pursuant to section 62 (2) of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C. 102 (a) (2)), section 3656 of title 18 of the United States Code, the second and third sentences of section 603, section 604 (5), or sections 671 to 675, inclusive, of title 28 of the United States Code, or who are appointed pursuant to section 792 (b) of title 28 of the United States Code, are hereby increased by amounts equal to the increases provided by subsections (a) and (b) in corresponding rates of compensation paid to officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949."

On page 4, line 19, strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)."

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I think it should be pointed out that the judiciary, under the present law, can now bring about the end result which the distinguished Senator from West Virginia seeks to accomplish by his amendment. The question was discussed before our subcommittee at some length, and I should like to have the RECORD show that what the Senator seeks to accomplish can presently be done under the law. However, I might say at this time that, personally, I do not see any real harm in the amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield in order that I may ask a few questions about this amendment?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. How many employees would be affected?

Mr. PASTORE. I am afraid I cannot answer that question.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from West Virginia might be able to answer it.

Mr. KILGORE. I cannot tell the Senator the exact number. They are what

might be called employees in the rather low-salaried bracket of judicial employees.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I have just been informed that 3,375 employees are included.

Mr. CARLSON. Are they secretaries and law clerks in judicial offices?

Mr. KILGORE. No; they are mainly clerks in district attorneys' offices, marshals' offices, and court clerks' offices; they are employees of that type.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I personally have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say also that, since we have put bankruptcy employees on a salaried basis instead of on a fee basis, the amendment includes clerks in bankruptcy commissioners' offices. From those offices far more revenue is derived than is spent in clerk hire and referee hire. It would include referees' employees.

Mr. CARLSON. I am not opposed to the inclusion of these employees in the bill which is now before the Senate. In fact, I think the idea has some merit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able Senator from South Carolina, having charge of the bill whether this bill covers all civil-service employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized to answer that question.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does it cover employees in the Library of Congress?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It does not cover all Federal employees in the civil service; it covers only those who are under the Classification Act.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does it cover employees in the Library of Congress?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It does cover employees in the Library of Congress.

Mr. McCARRAN. That has been a matter of concern with some of us for a long time, because if there is any underpaid group it is the group of workers in the Library of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They are included in the bill. That is a group which is not under the Classification Act, but it is included in the bill.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator also realizes that the employees covered by my amendment are classified employees. They include clerks in deputy marshals' offices and others who must have civil-service qualifications.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; they must have civil-service qualifications, but they were not included in the Classification Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, which I call up and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 19, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 3. Each of the rates of basic compensation provided by sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724, 79th Cong.), as amended, is hereby increased by (1) 8.8 percent, or (2) \$800 per annum, whichever is the lesser.

On page 7, line 20, it is proposed to change: "SEC. 3" to "SEC. 4."

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, this is the amendment I discussed briefly on Friday last, which I had previously discussed with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. I think it is their disposition to accept the amendment. It is designed to include in the bill the Foreign Service officers who were left out of it by the committee only because they were tender of the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee. I explained that the Foreign Relations Committee had been overwhelmed with work, that we had not considered it, but that as chairman of the subcommittee of the State Department's organization and its affairs I had been approached, and had agreed to offer this amendment. As I understand, the Senator from South Carolina is willing to take the amendment to conference. I might add that the House included the Foreign Service officers in the House bill.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to ask a question merely for information. I think such information should be available to the Senate, and personally I should like to have it. Are not these salaries fixed by the State Department?

Mr. McMAHON. In the same sense that the salaries of the other members of the classified service are fixed. In other words, it is up to the administrative agency to determine in what classification a particular officer or employee comes and when he is promoted, but the classifications, as I understand it, are fixed by law.

Mr. CARLSON. I note by the Senator's amendment that it deals with rates of basic compensation provided by sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946. The question I really want to clear up in my own mind is whether these employees do come under the Classification Act, and if this is a proper place to adjust their salaries.

Mr. McMAHON. I would say to the Senator from Kansas that the classification for the State Department has been provided it is true, by separate acts. The last time Congress adjusted salaries of Federal employees, the Foreign Service employees were taken care of in a sep-

arate bill. I see no reason why we should not take care of them at this time, particularly since the House of Representatives has done so, and it would seem to me to be a manifest injustice if we were to exclude these classified employees from the benefits of a raise in salary.

Mr. CARLSON. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut that I certainly want to accord these employees justice in any pay scale raise we may consider. I know that more than 19,000 employees are involved in the Senator's amendment. I assume, in fact I am going to make the statement, that they constitute a group that is entitled to consideration. I have only one question. I was hoping that some other committee, if the matter is within the jurisdiction of some other committee, would keep in mind the difference in living costs in some of the foreign countries as compared to living costs in this country. Everyone who is familiar with the costs in foreign countries must realize that in many cases Foreign Service employees are living in an economy which requires much less in the way of cost per day than is required for citizens and employees of the Government in this country. I sincerely hope someone is giving that question some thought, because I think there could be a disparity. I assure the Senator I do not want a disparity. I want to take care of these persons. But I trust that suggestion will be given some thought.

Mr. McMAHON. I think that is a fair observation. But I would say to the Senator that when the salaries were fixed originally, I believe that provision was made for the considerations which the Senator has mentioned. Of course, there are today some other considerations. I am sure the Senator is aware of that—such as the bad living conditions under which some Foreign Service employees live. There are some spots where neither the Senator from Kansas nor I would want to spend 3 or 4 or 5 years. From my study of the question I think that my amendment involves no disproportionate increase in salary.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have long felt that persons in Foreign Service should be included under the Classification Act. I have an amendment which would place them under the Classification Act for all purposes. I shall offer my amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut if the Senator is agreeable to that procedure.

I will explain to the Senator why I make that proposal. It used to be that a great many employees in the Foreign Service were paid more than \$10,000, and that at that time there was a ceiling of \$10,000 upon classified employees, above which no classified employees could go. Since the new law on the subject was passed brackets above \$10,000 have been established in the classified civil service, so Foreign Service employees can come under such classification. If For-

eign Service employees were brought under the Classification Act there would be no question raised in the Senate respecting increase in their salaries. Personally I should be glad to have such action taken.

Mr. McMAHON. This is a new thought to me, I will say to the Senator from South Carolina. Will the Senator tell me what the implications would be respecting the Foreign Service employees? In event the Senator's amendment should be adopted, would they be chosen through civil-service examinations rather than State Department examinations?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Only the pay provisions would be involved. The State Department would still have the right to choose its own employees.

Mr. McMAHON. Only the pay provisions would be involved?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. I can see no objection to the Senator's proposal. At any rate, since the Senator from South Carolina will take the matter to conference, and since it is something which does not appear in the bill, I shall be glad to see that action taken.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I shall be glad to take both the Senator's amendment and my amendment to conference.

Mr. McMAHON. I certainly have no objection to that.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer in the nature of a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is pending.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe the amendment which I offer as a substitute will cover what the Senator from Connecticut has in mind to cover.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut withdraw his amendment?

Mr. McMAHON. Before any further action is taken, I should like to see the Senator's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the substitute amendment, as follows:

SECTION 1. Hereafter, Foreign Service officers, including the class of career minister, and Foreign Service staff officers and employees, shall be compensated in accordance with the compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended and supplemented.

SEC. 2. Sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and all other provisions of such act which are inconsistent with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. Section 202 (2) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 4. The compensation of any Foreign Service officer or Foreign Service staff officer

or employee who is an officer or employee of the United States on the effective date of this amendment shall not be reduced by reason of the provisions of this amendment; but when any such position becomes vacant any new appointee shall be compensated in accordance with the compensation schedules of, and regulations issued by the Civil Service Commission under, the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, that would seem to me to cover the subject. I would assume that when the bill goes to conference, inasmuch as this provision is not contained in the House version of the bill, the chairman of the committee will see to it that there will be careful examination made of the amendment by the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] as a substitute for the amendment heretofore offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON].

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Under the law at the present time Foreign Service employees receive additional compensation because of the difference in living conditions abroad, and because of the difference between the value of the currency in the country in which they serve and our currency, and because of other factors.

There is another matter involved in this situation, and that is that nearly two-thirds of the employees in the Foreign Service are citizens of the foreign country in which they serve. They are not American citizens. They are not paid at the same rate. I am wondering if the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina, like a Mother Hubbard, covers too much.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will answer the Senator's question by saying that this amendment does not affect the salaries of civilian employees in foreign countries who are nationals of those countries. That is the intention of the amendment, and the way I had it drawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] for the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President—

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, does the Senator from North Dakota desire the floor? Is this bill about ready to pass?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is the same as the amendment I offered in connection with the postal bill, which was taken to conference the other day. The

amendment provides that the act shall be retroactive to July 1, 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, lines 21 and 22, it is proposed to strike out the words "after the date of its enactment" and insert the words "on or after July 1, 1951."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk which was intended to be offered as an amendment to an amendment to be proposed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. However, it is in the nature of a separate matter. I think it was left out of the bill because of an inadvertence in drafting the bill. I offer the amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, between lines 19 and 20, it is proposed to insert the following:

(c) Section 66 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 269) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 66. No director, officer, or employee of the Central Bank for Cooperatives, or of any production credit corporation, production credit association, or bank for cooperatives shall be paid compensation at a rate in excess of \$13,800 per annum."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman if he will accept this amendment, since it involves only one group of agencies which were omitted from the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is my understanding correct that all this amendment does is to make it possible to go above the ceiling stipulated by law, so as to grant the \$800 increase?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is correct. The amendment merely includes the agencies named along with the others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to ask if the agencies named are the only agencies in the Government which would be affected or which need to be taken care of?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator is correct. It takes care of the employees of the Central Bank for Cooperatives, or of any production credit corporation, production credit association, or bank for cooperatives.

Mr. CARLSON. As I understand, the amendment would correct a condition which should be corrected.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes. These agencies were inadvertently not included.

Mr. CARLSON. I have no objection. I think it is very commendable of the Senator to offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the clerk's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, between lines 19 and 20, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 3. (a) The annual compensation (including basic salary and additional compensation in lieu of overtime pay and night pay differential) of each officer and member of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, as increased by the act entitled "An act to provide for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to conform with the increased cost of living in the District of Columbia," approved July 14, 1945, as amended, and by the act entitled "An act to increase the compensation of certain employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1949, shall be further increased by 8.8 percent or \$800, whichever is the lesser. The proviso contained in the first sentence of the first section of said act of June 30, 1949, is hereby repealed; but no officer or member covered by this section shall, by reason of the enactment of this section, be paid with respect to any pay period, basic salary, or basic salary plus additional compensation at a rate in excess of \$11,130 per annum.

(b) (1) Each employee of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia whose salary is fixed and regulated by the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, except the Superintendent of Schools, shall receive, in addition to the compensation already provided by such act and by the act of June 30, 1949, compensation at the rate of 8.8 percent of the aggregate compensation provided by said acts, or \$800 per annum, whichever is the lesser.

(2) The basic and maximum salaries for all salary classes in title I of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, except class 29, are hereby increased by 8.8 percent or \$800, whichever is the lesser.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to extend to the Metropolitan Police, the White House Police, the United States Park Police, the teachers, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia the benefits proposed by the bill. These praiseworthy employees are not within the classified civil service but their right to an increase in compensation is manifestly identical with the right of those in the classified service for whose relief the pending measure provides. The necessity, the propriety, and the justice of granting the increases proposed by the amendment are so thoroughly and sympathetically understood by the Senate that it would be superfluous for me or anyone else to speak in behalf of the desired result. Therefore, I ask for the immediate adoption of the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this amendment deals with the employees of the District of Columbia mentioned therein. It will be recalled that a few years ago when we

were increasing the salaries of Federal employees we got into a jam in regard to the District of Columbia. The question of the sales tax was involved, and we could not pass a District bill. As I see it, this amendment would expedite matters. These salaries are not paid by the Federal Government. They are paid by the District of Columbia.

The Senator from West Virginia is a member of the District of Columbia Committee. I am a member of that committee, as is the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. This amendment will expedite matters, and save us from passing another bill.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, to the best of my knowledge and belief, every member of the Committee on the District of Columbia is in favor of the amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I assure the Senator from West Virginia that I think his amendment has merit, and that these

employees are entitled to a pay increase. There was one question which arose, and that was as to whether our committee had jurisdiction, or whether this provision would fit into the pending legislation. However, in view of the fact that we are voting increases for classified employees, I favor this increase.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

Sections 603 (b) and 603 (c) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

Grade	Per annum rates						
GS-1	\$2,600	\$2,680	\$2,760	\$2,840	\$2,920	\$3,000	\$3,080
GS-2	2,850	2,930	3,010	3,090	3,170	3,250	3,430
GS-3	3,050	3,130	3,210	3,290	3,370	3,450	3,530
GS-4	3,275	3,355	3,435	3,515	3,595	3,675	3,755
GS-5	3,500	3,625	3,750	3,875	4,000	4,125	4,250
GS-6	3,850	3,975	4,100	4,225	4,350	4,475	4,600
GS-7	4,225	4,350	4,475	4,600	4,725	4,850	4,975
GS-8	4,600	4,725	4,850	4,975	5,114	5,250	5,386
GS-9	5,005	5,141	5,277	5,413	5,549	5,685	5,821
GS-10	5,440	5,576	5,712	5,848	5,984	6,120	6,256
GS-11	5,875	6,093	6,310	6,528	6,746	6,963	
GS-12	6,963	7,181	7,398	7,616	7,834	8,051	
GS-13	8,269	8,486	8,704	8,922	9,149	9,357	
GS-14	9,574	9,792	10,000	10,200	10,400	10,600	
GS-15	10,800	11,050	11,300	11,550	11,800		
GS-16	12,000	12,200	12,400	12,600	12,800		
GS-17	13,000	13,200	13,400	13,600	13,800		
GS-18	14,800						

"(c) (1) The compensation schedule for the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule shall be as follows:

Grade	Per annum rates						
CPC-1	\$1,910	\$1,970	\$2,030	\$2,090	\$2,150	\$2,210	\$2,270
CPC-2	2,520	2,590	2,660	2,730	2,800	2,870	2,940
CPC-3	2,652	2,732	2,812	2,892	2,972	3,052	3,132
CPC-4	2,850	2,930	3,010	3,090	3,170	3,250	3,330
CPC-5	3,074	3,154	3,234	3,314	3,394	3,474	3,554
CPC-6	3,300	3,380	3,460	3,540	3,620	3,700	3,780
CPC-7	3,525	3,625	3,725	3,825	3,925	4,025	4,125
CPC-8	3,800	3,925	4,050	4,175	4,300	4,425	4,550
CPC-9	4,175	4,300	4,425	4,550	4,675	4,800	4,925
CPC-10	4,550	4,675	4,800	4,925	5,050	5,175	5,301

"(2) Charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of \$2,800 per annum, and head charwomen working part time at the rate of \$2,940 per annum."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to increase the salary rates under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, by a minimum of \$400, or 8.8 percent, whichever is greater, but not to exceed \$800.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator please explain what this amendment would do?

Mr. LANGER. As the Senator knows, this question was considered in the committee. In connection with the postal pay bill, an amendment was offered providing that salaries should be increased by 8.8 percent, with a floor of \$400, and a ceiling of \$800.

Mr. PASTORE. That is not very clear to me. Senate bill 622, which is now

pending, specifies that there shall be an increase of 8.8 percent, but not to exceed \$800.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator please tell me what this amendment would do to the bill?

Mr. LANGER. It puts a floor of \$400 in the bill, and it provides that no increase shall exceed \$800, which the bill does not now provide, as I understand.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the question of whether or not there should be a percentage increase across the board, or whether it should be a lump-sum increase applying to all employees in the Post Office Department and in the classified service, is one to which the committee gave considerable study and thought. I believe for the purposes of the RECORD it behooves me at this time to point out exactly what we are getting

into with amendments which are offered from the floor.

When S. 355, the postal pay-increase bill was under consideration last Friday the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] suggested a minimum of \$400. On the floor we worked out a compromise to the effect that the formula of 8.8 percent would apply to all postal workers, provided, however, that in no case would an employee's salary be increased by less than \$400.

In the postal pay-increase bill certain other adjustments were made with reference to grades 1 and 2, under which those grades were to be eliminated, and by which the employees in those two grades were to receive a \$200 increase. More than that, we tried to adjust the salaries of employees who came into the postal service subsequent to June 30, 1945.

As the postal pay-increase bill now stands there is a serious question in the minds of myself and many members of the committee as to whether or not the bill as it was passed does not in fact grant an increase of a minimum of \$600 with reference to postal employees. In other words, to make the RECORD a little clearer, the bill originally provided for an increase of 8.8 percent.

A serious question exists whether the \$400 minimum is to be applied after the adjustment of \$200 takes place, or whether the figure of \$400 is to be used after the increase has been computed on the basis of 8.8 percent, in which case no employee of the Post Office Department in any category would receive an increase of less than \$400.

To connect the same argument to the pending bill, and apply it to an employee who today is working in the Post Office Department in grade 1, and is receiving in the neighborhood of \$2,670, if we grant him a \$600 increase, it would mean that anyone now employed under the classified system who is receiving \$2,650 in GS-3 would be getting under the bill we are now considering, S. 622, an increase of only \$250.

In other words, to point up the harm that can come from floor amendments, I am saying now that under the postal bill which we passed last Friday, anyone presently employed in the Post Office Department in grade 1 would get an increase of \$600, whereas a comparable employee in the classified service, who receives \$2,650, in GS-2, would get under the bill which has been approved by the committee an increase of only \$250.

In that way, we would create in our Government a situation under which two men in the same family of Federal workers, receiving the same amount of money today, would, under the action of the Senate as the two bills now stand, S. 355, which was passed Friday, and the bill now being considered, the following difference in salary. The employee in the postal department would get an increase of \$600, under the interpretation being given to the postal pay increase by some Members of the Senate, and at least \$400, according to the interpretation which I believe was intended, but not made clear. On the other hand, the employee in the classified service, em-

ployed in GS-3, would receive an increase of only \$250.

I say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], while there is abundant argument for consistency, namely, that we ought to undertake in this bill to provide the same minimum of \$400, as fixed in the postal pay bill—and it is hard to deviate from the argument of consistency—the fact still remains that this is what we are doing: To employees who work, let us say, in CPC 2, receiving in the neighborhood of \$1,600, \$1,700, or \$1,800, we would give an increase of \$400, which in fact would be an increase of 25 percent. I believe we would completely violate the provisions of the Wage Stabilization Act.

Mr. President, I say very frankly that while I can adhere to the argument of consistency, I can also see the absurdity of proceeding in that way.

Mr. LANGER. The purpose of the amendment is to put a floor of \$400 in the bill. Certainly anyone working in the Government ought to have an income of at least \$2,500. There is nothing inconsistent or ridiculous about it. It gives a person enough to live on. Certainly a family needs \$2,500 a year to live on.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in view of the statement which has just been made by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], I believe that it might be well to discuss again the postal pay increase bill which we passed last week. The bill, S. 355, which we approved last Friday, eliminates two grades. The figures submitted to us by the Post Office Department show it would cost the Post Office Department \$10,000,000. For all postal employees, including supervisors and postmasters, a \$400 across-the-board pay increase except fourth class postmasters and hourly paid employees would cost \$189,350,000. Therefore, how anyone could assume that it would mean a \$600 increase for all employees is more than I can understand.

The \$200 increase, which would eliminate two grades, according to the Post Office Department figures, would cost \$10,000,000, while the \$400 increase, which is 200 percent of \$200 would come to \$189,350,000.

In addition to that, we advanced two grades of postal employees who have entered the service since June 30, 1945, and who have not benefited by the two grade advances. It affects 150,000 postal employees, and would cost \$28,410,000.

Personally, I am confident that the Senate, when it acted on the postal pay increase bill, understood that we were eliminating two grades, and that those two grades had not been used during the past few years, except in a limited number of cases.

Therefore, the total amount added by the elimination of the two grades would not exceed \$10,000,000, and could not possibly be interpreted as giving \$200 to every employee, because the \$400 increase totals more than \$189,000,000. I wanted to make that statement for the RECORD.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. I believe the distinguished Senator from Kansas will con-

cede that the question has been raised as to whether or not the \$400 minimum is to be applied after the computation of 8.8 percent or whether the \$400 minimum is to be considered before the computation of the 8.8 percent, which would make a difference of \$200 when all the adjustments are to be made. For the purpose of the RECORD I believe it ought to be clearly shown that the intent of Congress was that all we were trying to do was to insure a minimum increase of \$400 to every employee, instead of giving an increase of \$600.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Kansas wanted it definitely understood that no postal employee was to receive an increase of less than \$400, and that the adjustments, as proposed in Senate bill 355, would have to be worked out later. I admit that we were caught a little unawares on the floor, and I have not had time to go into all the effects of it. My personal belief is that either \$400 or 8.8 percent would make very little difference in this legislation.

CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is the day on which our Nation does honor to the Constitution of the United States, on the anniversary of its adoption.

It is sometimes difficult to discuss objectively matters which are close to our hearts, because our very familiarity with them leads us to presume an equal familiarity on the part of our hearers, and thus we tend to pass lightly over points which may be basic to full understanding. Our Constitution is one of the things too many Americans take for granted, and for that very reason we fail to grasp its monumental value.

Those who look no further back than the eighteenth century for the idea of government by the consent of the governed, that is, the people; and those who look no further back than the sixteenth century for the idea of the natural law, fail to see in the Preamble of our Constitution the outline of a republic as set for by St. Augustine in the fifth century in his "city of God." There one reads of union of people in community, seeking to establish justice and the common good. There one reads of liberty as the heritage of man from his Creator. There, too, the citizens of republics may learn how slavery, the grim alternative, may overtake a people lost to prudence and becoming a mere mass.

While there are among us many who have developed a great—almost religious—veneration for our Constitution, all of us arrived at our status as legislators by the act of taking an oath to support it. Yet, all too few of us ever have occasion or opportunity to see certain contrasts which illustrate the great values of this document. It may seem strange, but I have found it true, that many who have the fiercest love of our Constitution are men who have lived abroad.

Over the years I have had occasion to know many of our diplomats and military men stationed in other lands, some of whom, in fact, have passed more adult years in Europe and Asia than in their own country. These men whom

we send abroad, from ambassadors to clerks, have opportunities not vouchsafed to the rest of us. It is startling to talk with them, to see how bitterly they describe the contortions which the very process of daily living requires of citizens in lands that are dictatorships. It is startling to hear them speak with cynical familiarity of their professional problems when working in countries in Europe, in Asia, and in Latin America—in rigid, static governments, where laws are made by police, or under regimes where judges act on orders from above, where wealthy gangs take care of their own, where shootings occur on the streets, and where it would be naive to entertain the assumption—natural and normal in America—that murders are dealt with by courts where justice is done. These things are startling to us because our Constitution, while guarding the power of the States, guarantees speedy and public trial, and trial by jury.

The world is constantly getting smaller, politically speaking; and indeed it is time we learned, if we have not learned already, about the shocking status of human rights in those lands which account for two-thirds of the world's human beings. The nations with the largest number of slave camps and those with the largest starving masses are those in which the rights of life and liberty are not sustained by safeguards to private property. Our Constitution relies for its support of property rights upon the Christian concept that man needs property to develop personality. This personality determines his service to God and country, his education, and his vote.

In scores of countries the movement of goods across a city limit or a county line or the boundary of a province is taxed. The economies of many European, Asiatic, and Latin American regions groan from the imposition of interstate taxes and obstructions. Only a few countries have adopted the startling principle, written into our own Constitution, that trade between citizens of a single nation—and, let us say, between regions—shall move unhampered. No multiplication of TVA's for Asia can ever do for the Asian individual what the simple provisions of our Constitution regarding rights in property have done for American citizens.

Our Constitution provides that every few years all officers of the republic shall stand before the people for judgment, for endorsement, or for removal from office. This provision we take for granted, because we started learning about it in kindergarten. Yet, as we survey this shrinking world, as we observe the great movements of masses of peoples, as we watch the revolutionary movements among millions in Asia and in Europe, as we see these movements resorting more and more to mass violence or demagogic manipulation, we are forced to face a frightening statistical fact. That fact is that only a ridiculously small percentage of the men and women of the world have the right to cast a ballot. Only in these few nations can an individual make his own voice heard on the question of

whether he is to live as a free man or as a statistical figure. The franchise has made of America a people. Its lack has left Asia with its masses. Our republic presupposed a people developed from the principle of the free-voting individual. The mere politicizing of social groups or of economic associations will not produce a people. We may build dams, drain swamps, or exterminate germs; but we cannot build a people without the individual ballot and the guidance of a free press can give.

The American Constitution, compiled by that unique group of men 164 years ago, is so remarkable that the genius of its provisions becomes apparent only when we take a look at the way other societies have mishandled and misdirected the energies of their peoples; when we see the class wars, the civil wars, and the great social frictions which many countries have solved or resolved only by creating police states.

By the Articles of Confederation the United States expressed their abhorrence of tyrants and despots. By the Constitution they controlled the tyranny of majorities and the violence of demagogically led masses. They devised a system of government, operating through three branches, two of which are responsible directly, and one indirectly, to the people of the Republic. They established a union government having real power, and placed the control of that power in the people.

In the 164-year span which has followed the adoption of the Constitution, 32 men have been elected President of the United States, and numberless Members of Congress have also been elected. Each candidate has had to reach high office through the peaceful process of persuasion. While that persuasion process may involve a wide range of activity, from great statesmanship to little undiscovered acts of human kindness, and while high office has been attained at times by frivolous politicians who promised all things to all men, the fact of the power in the people remains. An historian of freedom of the nineteenth century, Lord Acton, hailed as a great discovery the American principle that the nation can control the state—a discovery second only to the English invention of the representative legislature and one based upon the momentous pronouncement which gave the state its measure of power and rendered it benign by giving religion at the same time its greatest freedom: Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's.

Yes, Mr. President, the scholars and patriots who put together our constitution had an insight into human nature, an understanding of human weaknesses, of human envy, of ambition, of human cruelty and of all man's baser instincts, which even the most eminent of today's army of psychologists could not surpass. They understood the possible patterns of human behavior, and they wrote a document which set up grooves and channels for man's drives and impulses: No bills of attainder, no cruelty, no executive power to tax, no expenditure without a law. But, better

still, a free press, free speech, free service to God, were guaranteed.

Written when the Nation's population was smaller than that of many of our States today, the organic law of the land now serves over 150,000,000 persons. There are few human contingencies, few new situations, which it did not envision at least in principle, and for which it did not provide a standard based on principles of universal right. This document was written at a time when transport was handled by ox-cart, canoe, and horse-drawn carriage, yet it has successfully provided the legal principles and the guide for a civilization whose air-transport industry alone has produced a library of air law. It was written at a time when there were but few nascent industries and when the civilization of the United States was mainly agricultural, yet it has furnished the legal precepts for a society highly industrialized and technologically advanced, in which, let it be said, the independent farmer still holds his own. Against the operation of unlimited greed the constitution provided due control. When it enshrined the principle of private property and the concept of free enterprise, it accepted the Christian economic principle that national wealth is the product of the savings of a secure citizenry, that national strength is measurable in terms of family savings.

The Constitution of the United States, Mr. President, embodies that balance of force and freedom which has been dreamed of for centuries by the peoples of Western Europe and the Americas. Eastern Europe, the Middle East, and Asia await the dream. But only one land has reached such heights of freedom by following the precepts of a document which gives encouragement to private initiative while curbing man's avarice, which provides for the greatest stability in Government by making possible adjustment to change. All the progress in this country's 164-year history since the constitution was adopted has been made possible and protected by this great mother document. It is ever present, is impossible to ignore, is hard to circumvent. To the Nation facing its future it is the epitome of hope. The Constitution is like a lighted house to which one may go to when it becomes too dark to see, like the care of a mother for the child that senses fear, like a great reservoir of juridical wisdom for the Nation's leaders, statesmen, jurists and plain citizens when baffled by the new problems of new decades. The magnanimity of the people, the power of the Government, and the wealth and the progress which have occurred in the United States of America have their source in it.

Mr. President, on this anniversary of the adoption of our Constitution, I hope all of us may have a true appreciation of its value. This is the document which has fostered and made possible the most progressive society in history, the widest spread of human rights, and a technological civilization which in 164 years has encouraged the production by free men of things needed by mankind in larger measure than were created in

the preceding 20 centuries. The Constitution was conceived in genius, and for 164 years we have shown the political acumen to adhere. May God grant that, as individuals and as a Nation, we may have the wisdom and the courage and the prudence to protect it as it has protected us.

Today there are those who look abroad and profess to see something more dazzling, like those who have looked at Russia, and at other states that follow the negativism of Karl Marx as interpreted by Lenin and Stalin. They profess to see an improvement. There are those who are bent on bringing that Marxist-Lenin-Stalinist system here to our own shores, and those who encourage that systems' growth in other lands. And some there are who, holding a republic to be a decadent form of government, would advocate the politicizing of social groups rather than inculcating the free individual ballot. They impugn the document which has created this great Nation. We must resist them in every field of their activity and by every technique available to us. Those who wish to destroy our organic law, or merely to substitute for it the subversion of political science to socio-economics subordinating man to the functional state, are seeking to take from this Nation something more precious than the individual life of any one of us. As long as misguided men attack the Constitution, men of good will must fight to protect it. Our freedom was won not through passivity, but through blood and brawn and spiritual struggle. Its preservation demands of us no lesser willingness to consecration and sacrifice.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to have the Senator yield to me for one moment.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I desire to thank and to congratulate the Senator from Nevada for the remarkable speech which he has delivered, the eloquent tribute which he has paid to the Constitution of the United States. It is one of the great speeches which have been delivered in his Chamber for a long time, and my prediction is that it will ring down through the years to come.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1726) to provide for the organization of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4496), making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes;

agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McGRATH, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HORAN, Mr. SCHWABE, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAHON, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. SIKES, Mr. RILEY, Mr. CANNON, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGLESWORTH, and Mr. SCRIVNER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

INCREASE OF BASIC RATES OF COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEELY in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF AFFAIRS AND EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPLE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 210) was read and referred

to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Whereas it has been disclosed in the Senate that the Commodity Credit Corporation of the Department of Agriculture has recently been involved in subleasing from a private concern storage space leased by such concern from the War Assets Administration at Camp Crowder; and

Whereas such private concern has by thus acting as intermediary between two Government agencies made a tremendous profit without the risk of private capital and with commensurate loss to the Government; and

Whereas the last-mentioned loss to the Government came out of price-support funds which are not appropriated and are therefore not subject to effective supervision by the Congress and by the General Accounting Office; and

Whereas it has also been disclosed that 22 past and present employees of the Farm Credit Administration of the Department of Agriculture and of agencies supervised by it in the St. Louis district have been involved in (1) speculation in properties in which the Farm Credit Administration and its agencies were interested, and (2) dealings with persons having business with the Farm Credit Administration and its agencies; and

Whereas the activities aforesaid may have been illegal and may bring discredit to, and lessen the public confidence in, the Department of Agriculture and the agencies concerned; and

Whereas it appears likely that the instances aforesaid are not isolated cases: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved—

SECTION 1. That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study of all activities of officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture which may tend to discredit or lessen public confidence in the Department of Agriculture or any of its agencies, and, in particular, to make a full and complete study of the administration of price-support funds with a view to determining the extent to which officers or employees of the Department of Agriculture have misused such funds or have profited or have permitted others to profit illegally or improperly by the manner in which such funds have been administered. The committee shall report its findings together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable to the Senate not later than September 1, 1952.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$150,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the resolution calls for a full and complete investigation by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the administration of the farm price-support program, and the handling of all other funds of the Department of Agriculture.

The purpose of the investigation now proposed is to determine the extent if any to which officers or employees of the Department of Agriculture or any of its agencies, including the Commodity Credit Corporation, have misused such funds, or have personally profited by the manner in which such funds have been administered, or have engaged in other activities which may tend to discredit

or lessen public confidence in the Department of Agriculture and the farm program. Corn and wheat and oil do not mix well with graft and corruption.

The situation has been brought to a head by the charges made last Thursday in the Senate by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] that the Commodity Credit Corporation paid out \$382,201.11 of price-support funds in 20 months for the use of buildings leased on September 19, 1949, from Mid-West Storage & Realty Co. of Kansas City, which, only 4 days previously, had leased the same buildings from the War Assets Administration for less than \$1,000 a month.

This follows a disclosure that 22 past and present employees of the Farm Credit Administration at St. Louis have been involved in speculation in oil interests in lands in which the Farm Credit Administration and its agencies were interested.

These unsavory transactions require a full investigation by a Senate committee of the mishandling of USDA funds. I believe the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is the logical and appropriate committee. The Mid-West Storage & Realty Co. and the St. Louis Land Bank may or may not be isolated cases. There may be other activities where "rats have found the cheese," to use Jesse Jones' expressive phrase.

Price-support funds are not appropriated. They are not subject to effective supervision by the General Accounting Office. This situation places a heavy responsibility on Congress. I hope the Senate will act and act promptly.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I join with the Senator from Missouri and other Senators in submitting this resolution, not because I believe that any great number of Department of Agriculture employees are guilty of malfeasance in office, or of any particular crime. However, there has been divulged enough of an unsavory nature to warrant a thorough investigation into the entire affair.

The other day the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] pointed out that a group of persons had leased property from one agency of government and then leased it back to another agency of government—in this case the Commodity Credit Corporation—and made what was apparently a profit of around \$300,000, with no risk involved, and no capital investment of any amount. I happen to know that the case which was pointed out by the Senator from Delaware is only one of a large number of similar cases in which certain Government agencies, namely, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the War Assets Administration, have turned over storage space to private citizens at what I believe to be a very low rate of rental. They never would tell me how much rent was received for those properties. I do not know how the Senator from Delaware found out about the case which he pointed out the other day. When the properties are turned over, we might say that they are turned over to the faithful.

den, Hunt, Kefauver, Kem, McCarthy, Magnuson, Martin, O'Connor, O'Mahoney, Robertson, Saltonstall, Schoeppel, Taft, Thomas of Oklahoma, Tobey, Tydings, Vandenberg, Wiley.

So Mr. THYE's amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I call particular attention to this vote, which appears at page 14309 because in the article, to which I have referred, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] are listed as those who will lead the fight against this proposal on the floor of the Senate when the new tax bill is considered. Yet, as can be seen from the RECORD, when the roll was called last year on this same amendment we find that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] voted the other way or to include all livestock under the capital gains provision. If the article of today is at all accurate they are going to come over and join my philosophy, and I shall welcome their support.

I should like also to point out the inaccuracy of the article, in that I have never been a breeder of turkeys, so therefore

am not affected regardless. I would not support this proposal, because as the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] pointed out last year during the debate, the benefits of such a provision would go entirely to the large operators. Furthermore capital gains provisions are not practical for any type livestock. If we want to give the farmers tax credits there are many other ways which would be more practical.

PAY INCREASES FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2 it is proposed to strike out lines 13 to 16, and on page 3 to strike out lines 1 to 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Sections 603 (b) and 603 (c) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

Grade	Per annum rates						
GS-1.....	\$2,420	\$2,500	\$2,580	\$2,660	\$2,740	\$2,820	\$2,900
GS-2.....	2,695	2,775	2,855	2,935	3,015	3,095	3,175
GS-3.....	2,915	2,995	3,075	3,155	3,235	3,315	3,395
GS-4.....	3,160	3,240	3,320	3,400	3,480	3,560	3,640
GS-5.....	3,410	3,535	3,660	3,785	3,910	4,035	4,160
GS-6.....	3,795	3,920	4,045	4,170	4,295	4,420	4,545
GS-7.....	4,205	4,330	4,455	4,580	4,705	4,830	4,955
GS-8.....	4,620	4,745	4,870	4,995	5,120	5,245	5,370
GS-9.....	5,060	5,185	5,310	5,435	5,560	5,685	5,810
GS-10.....	5,500	5,625	5,750	5,875	6,000	6,125	6,250
GS-11.....	5,940	6,140	6,340	6,540	6,740	6,940	
GS-12.....	7,040	7,240	7,440	7,640	7,840	8,040	
GS-13.....	8,360	8,560	8,760	8,960	9,160	9,360	
GS-14.....	9,600	9,800	10,000	10,200	10,400	10,600	
GS-15.....	10,800	11,050	11,300	11,550	11,800		
GS-16.....	12,000	12,200	12,400	12,600	12,800		
GS-17.....	13,000	13,200	13,400	13,600	13,800		
GS-18.....	14,800						

"(c) (1) The compensation schedule for the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule shall be as follows:

Grade	Per annum rates						
CPC-1.....	\$1,660	\$1,720	\$1,780	\$1,840	\$1,900	\$1,960	\$2,020
CPC-2.....	2,330	2,400	2,470	2,540	2,610	2,680	2,750
CPC-3.....	2,475	2,555	2,635	2,715	2,795	2,875	2,955
CPC-4.....	2,695	2,775	2,855	2,935	3,015	3,095	3,175
CPC-5.....	2,940	3,020	3,100	3,180	3,260	3,340	3,420
CPC-6.....	3,190	3,270	3,350	3,430	3,510	3,590	3,670
CPC-7.....	3,435	3,535	3,635	3,735	3,835	3,935	4,035
CPC-8.....	3,740	3,865	3,990	4,115	4,240	4,365	4,490
CPC-9.....	4,15	4,275	4,400	4,525	4,650	4,775	4,900
CPC-10.....	4,56	4,690	4,815	4,940	5,065	5,190	5,315

"(2) Charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of \$2,610 per annum, and head charwomen working part time at the rate of \$2,750 per annum."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am offering a substitute for the Langer amendment, in the hope that there can be worked out in conference a compromise which will do away with the \$400 flat increase plus the 8.8 percent increase.

I do this because I am fearful that the adoption of the \$400 flat increase would destroy our wage stabilization program by setting a pattern throughout the

country which will be impossible for industry to follow, without largely increasing the cost of the articles which industrial workers are making.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator inform me what, under the Senator's amendment, the percentage increase would be for the lowest bracket, in lieu of the \$400 flat increase?

Mr. MONRONEY. It would be a 10-percent increase.

Mr. LONG. What would the \$400 increase be in terms of percentage?

Mr. MONRONEY. In the lowest brackets it would amount to about 28 percent, under the \$400 across-the-board increase, to messenger boys and the lowest paid scale of employees.

Mr. LONG. Some employees would receive as much as 28 percent, would they not?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. In the difficult period in which we find ourselves, with the danger of inflation, if the Senate should set a pattern for wage demands throughout the country by adopting a legislative mandate for that type of raise, I am very fearful of what would happen to the price line.

I dislike not being able to advocate raising the salaries of classified employees more than 10 percent, although that is approximately the cost-of-living increase. A blanket \$400 increase is what we provided in the postal pay bill, and that is the amount proposed by the Langer amendment. It is not used by any industry. Increases are figured on a percentage basis. When labor bargains collectively it does not bargain on lump-sum basis. It wants the higher skills to receive a percentage increase.

Furthermore, the placement of a \$400 automatic increase in every one of the 18 grades under the Civil Service Act would again serve to disrupt the carefully arranged differentials between the various grades for which the employees qualify and we would begin to compress the top against the bottom. Sooner or later we would have to reconsider our action and make a complete revision, as we have had to do in the past, and it would take a year to straighten it out again.

As I say, my amendment will cost the country considerably less than will the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota. The cost of his amendment will amount to approximately \$377,000,000, while the cost of my amendment will amount to approximately \$340,000,000. The original committee bill, providing for an 8.8-percent increase would cost in the neighborhood of \$307,000,000.

So I am offering this amendment in the hope of making it possible to arrive at a compromise by which we shall do justice and equity to the civil-service workers under the classified-pay scales and yet not disrupt the Nation's inflation-control efforts and start throughout the country a whole round of demands for wage increases based on the \$400-minimum formula which the Senate itself would be setting by means of the Langer amendment.

I understand that the House has before it a bill providing for only a \$400 increase. If the house passes that bill and if we adopt the percentage-increase amendment, when the bill goes to conference the conferees can consider the question as between the percentage-increase provision and the provision for a lump sum \$400 payment.

Some have asked how the \$400 figure was arrived at. As a matter of fact, the changes made in the bill itself took care

of most of the \$400. On the other hand, too great a change was provided in that way, because we abolished the first two grades and provided for automatic increases of \$200 for those who had not had their pay increased. So not too great a change was made by the Carlson amendment. However, the Langer amendment, which I hope to amend by means of my compromise, would change the entire arrangement, because the bill as it came from the committee did not contain any provision for an increase to take up a part of the \$400 extra, as the postal workers pay bill did.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator tell me the lowest pay received by any Federal employee? What is the lowest pay for a Federal worker now employed under the GS grade system?

Mr. MONRONEY. Under the GS grade, the lowest pay is \$2,240, which is the pay for GS-1. My amendment would increase that to \$2,420 or a \$180 increase.

Mr. LONG. Are we to understand that now a person simply cannot be classified for full-time Federal employment at less than \$2,240; and under the Senator's amendment, a Federal employee at the very lowest grade, at the bottom or starting grade, would be paid \$2,420?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; under GS-1. The custodial workers are employed at the present time at rates as low as \$1,510, in the case of messengers and others who are in no way skilled employees. In the next bracket the rate jumps to \$2,120. My amendment would increase the first one by \$150.

The largest group of employees are in GS-3, and their salary at the present time is \$2,650. My amendment would increase that salary to \$2,915.

When we reach GS-7, the present salary is \$3,325, and my amendment would increase it to \$4,205.

One other thing which I think every Member of the Senate should be careful to consider is that 80 percent of all the employees about whom we are talking work outside the city of Washington. That means that every one of the Government employees in that group of 80 percent will be in competition with workers in private industry. If we increase the grades of those Government workers, we automatically affect the rates which private industry will have to pay. In other words, a lawyer who must hire a stenographer or a store which has to hire a bookkeeper or an industry which must employ certain workers would be forced to meet the scale we would put into effect if we adopted the Langer amendment, and the result would be to raise the wage scale in the local community to that extent. Every week I receive letters from persons in small, county-seat towns saying, "Some of our employees in the courthouse or some who

are working in the various agricultural programs are receiving more pay than are the vice presidents and cashiers of the local banks." I think we must be careful not to get the Government pay scale too far out of line with that of private industry.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. If I correctly understand the Senator's argument, it is that we put ourselves in a very inconsistent position if we try to control wages and prices and prevent them from getting out of hand by holding them down to a 10-percent increase, on the one hand, while on the other hand we, ourselves, provide for an increase of as much as 28 percent for some Federal workers.

Mr. MONRONEY. That would be true in the case of the lower grades; and in other cases the increases would be 20 percent or 17 percent or 11 percent. However, the result would be to destroy everything we are insisting upon under the wage-stabilization program, namely, a limit on the amount of pay increases.

I think the pattern we set by the action we take in connection with this matter may very well be adopted in the demands of labor organizations, who will say, "The Senate by unanimous consent voted to increase the pay scales of Government workers 28 percent. Therefore, all pay scales should be increased 28 percent."

Everyone knows that labor is a most important factor in connection with the cost of living and in connection with determining the cost of goods produced by labor. We cannot control prices unless we control the cost of labor.

Labor has agreed to a formula which is working satisfactorily. For the Congress at this time to vitiate that formula by saying, "We will pay a \$400 increase to every Government worker," and for Congress then to agree to a pay increase for Federal workers based on a formula of an 8.8-percent raise in pay, would set a wage pattern which would be absolutely impossible.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. First, I wish to compliment the junior Senator from Oklahoma. I know he has worked very hard on this bill, together with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and myself, on the subcommittee.

Mr. MONRONEY. The junior Senator from Maryland was very helpful in the work of the committee and of the subcommittee, and in the final work on the bill.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I thank the Senator.

Let me say that I consider this question which has been raised is most important. I think the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma is a fine one.

To back up what the Senator from Oklahoma has said, I cite again to the Senate that all responsible heads of Government departments who passed on this matter said that the increases must be

made on a percentage basis, not on a flat-sum basis.

So, I think the chairman of the committee will do well to accept this amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator.

Another point where the classified pay bill differs from the postal pay bill is that as a rule the postal workers when first employed start at the very bottom, and receive their pay increases on the basis of longevity; and usually there is very little chance for them to advance in grade otherwise. On the other hand, in connection with the general group of Federal Government workers, a worker can begin at GS-3, or GS-5, or GS-7, and then can rise in grade; and we know that promotions are far more rapid in the classified service than they are in the postal system.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is it not also true that the postal employees have not been reclassified since 1945, whereas the civil employees were reclassified in 1949?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is eminently correct in that.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me that I may make an observation?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I felt all along, and I think the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Maryland agree with me, that the practical and realistic way of meeting this responsibility is to do it on a percentage-wise basis. Mr. Ramspeck appeared before the committee and showed very clearly that we had striven for quite some time to bring our classified system into line. We did that in October 1949. I realize the impact of the argument which is made, that the employees at the bottom of the scale need the help much more than do some at the top. It is a very glamorous argument, as I said once before, and a very attractive argument to make, but the fact still remains that we must keep in mind the point which has been made by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, namely, that 80 percent of the Federal employees work outside the District of Columbia.

In line with that argument, I have before me a chart which has been prepared by the United States Civil Service Commission, which bears out in very vivid fashion the argument which we are trying to make. It is a chart which shows the prevailing wages for comparable work in private industry and in Government in different localities. I am now looking at the classification, calculating machine operators.

In San Francisco the weekly wage for a calculating machine operator, on the average, is \$54; in Denver, Colo., it is \$44; in Boston, Mass., it is \$41.50; in Atlanta, Ga., it is \$46; in Chicago, Ill., it is \$51.50; in Portland, Oreg., it is \$50; in Bridgeport, Conn., it is \$45.50; in Dayton, Ohio, it is \$53.50; and in New York, it is \$50.50.

If we were to apply the 8.8 system, which was in the original bill, the pay for that same type of Federal work in some localities would be \$51.27 per week, which is pretty close to the average, perhaps slightly above it. Yet, if we applied the \$400 minimum, that position would pay \$54.82, which would be 82 cents more than the highest, which is being paid in San Francisco, and it would be \$10 and \$14 more in Denver, Colo., and in Boston, Mass., respectively.

In view of the action which was taken by the Senate last Friday in allowing the minimum of not less than \$400 for postal clerks, I realize that our subcommittee is put in a rather awkward position to bring these two forces into line with one another; but I am convinced that the plan for a solution suggested by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is the fairer of the two.

I think it has been established that

the cost of living, on the average, has risen about 9.4 percent since October, 1949, and in food alone it has risen about 12 percent. I feel that the 10-percent amendment will not only keep the classified system in line, but that, in fact, it will give us something that we may talk about in conference, in the hope of bringing forth a bill which will do equity not alone to the postal workers, but also to the classified workers.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island for that observation.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me further, I ask unanimous consent to have the chart to which I referred inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

EXHIBIT 1

Comparison of average weekly salaries for selected office occupations in several metropolitan areas and weekly entrance salary rates for comparable positions in the Federal service, 1951

Occupation	Private industry									Federal Government		Proposed	
	San Francisco, Calif., January	Denver, Colo., January	Boston, Mass., March	Atlanta, Ga., March	Chicago, Ill., April	Portland, Ore., June	Bridgeport, Conn., June	Dayton, Ohio, June	New York, N. Y., April	Grade of largest group			
										GS-2	GS-3	8.8percent	\$400
Typist:													
Class A.....	\$51.00	\$41.50	\$43.00	\$42.00	\$50.00	\$48.00	\$47.50	\$55.00	\$48.50		\$50.96	\$55.44	\$58.66
Class B.....	44.50	33.50	36.50	36.50	44.00	42.50	43.50	44.00	41.00	\$47.12		51.27	54.82
Stenographers:													
General.....	55.00	45.50	43.00	47.00	51.50	51.50	50.50	55.00	49.50		50.96	55.44	58.66
Technical.....	57.50		46.00	47.00	57.50				57.00				
Transcribing-machine operators.....		42.50	39.50	42.50	42.00		46.00	48.50	48.00	47.12		51.27	54.82
Bookkeeping-machine operators.....	51.00	42.50	40.50	40.50	48.00	47.50	41.50	46.00	45.50		50.96	55.44	58.66
Calculating-machine operators.....	54.00	44.00	41.50	40.00	51.50	50.00	45.50	53.50	50.50	47.12		51.27	54.82
File clerks:													
Class A.....		39.50	42.50	42.50	46.50	47.50		50.50	48.50		50.96	55.44	58.66
Class B.....	42.50	36.00	34.50	35.00	40.50	39.00	40.00	41.50	38.00	47.12		51.27	54.82

Source: Private industry rates from the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I feel that I should make a statement at this time, in view of the fact that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] was called out on official business and will not be present for the final vote. He offered the amendment for a \$400 increase for classified employees. I regret that I am unable to discuss this particular amendment, with the same degree of knowledge which I thought I had regarding the postal employees' pay raise, since I have not been a member of the subcommittee which dealt with this subject. The Senate this afternoon has had an opportunity to observe some of the problems which we encounter when we begin to discuss pay raises on the Senate floor, and offer amendments to a bill of this type.

Personally I have always thought that our committee's recommendations regarding the pay of postal and classified employees were too low. I did not think that percentage increases of 8.8 and 8.4 were sufficiently high in view of the increased cost of living. It was for that reason that I felt we should offer an amendment calling for a flat increase for postal employees of \$400. We could

justify it. I could justify it on the ground that there had not been a reclassification in the postal service since 1945.

As I stated, I am not so familiar with this particular amendment, but I am pleased that a proposal is being made to increase the salary of classified employees by 10 percent. As the chairman has stated, he is offering to take the amendment to conference, where we shall endeavor to work it out between the House and Senate. If the House approves a flat \$400 increase we should be able to deal justly with our classified employees.

I sincerely hope that the conference committee will give serious consideration to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota. I think it has much merit, and I think it should be given further consideration when and if we meet in conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask whether the chairman of the committee would consider accepting this substitute and taking it to conference.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am unable to speak for the committee as to taking the amendment to conference, but personally, after all, I may say three of the members of the subcommittee of my committee have agreed to 10 percent instead of 8.8, in order to get rid of the other question of the \$400 increase, as the minimum. I feel impelled to go along with the Senator and agree to it, and I certainly ask that the Senate do likewise, in order that we may not upset the entire Stabilization Board. I think that is what it would be apt to do.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator. I yield the floor, and ask for a vote.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I hope I may have the attention of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from South Carolina. The bill, as we know, provides increases for all those under civil service. As the Senator will recall, in 1946 Congress took the doctors, dentists, and nurses in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration from under civil service, and I think the tremendous improvement which has been made in the medical care of our veterans since that time has well confirmed the wisdom of that act of Congress.

If the bill were to pass in its present form, we should find that all the civil-service employees within the Veterans' Administration, along with civil-service employees within other Government agencies, will receive the increases in pay, but there will be no increase whatever for the doctors, dentists, nurses, and employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration. I am therefore offering an amendment which I hope will take care of the personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans'

Administration, and I hope the distinguished chairman of the committee will accept the amendment. I send forward an amendment, which I offer, and which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, after line 19, it is proposed to add the following new subsection (f) to section 2:

The rate of basic compensation for physicians, dentists, nurses, and other employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration whose rates of basic compensation are provided by Public Law 293, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved January 3, 1946, as amended, are hereby increased 10 percent, or \$800 per annum, whichever is the lesser.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as I said, this amendment would simply give to the doctors, dentists, and nurses and the employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration the same increases exactly as those provided for the civil-service employees in the Veterans' Administration and the civil-service employees in the other departments and agencies of the Government.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from Alabama has called this matter to our attention. Some years ago—I think, in 1946—this class of workers was taken from the Classification Act; and also from civil service.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It was thought at that time, that by so doing an improvement in the service would be effected. At this time the Senator from Alabama is not proposing to put them back under civil service.

Mr. HILL. Not at all.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The only thing he is proposing is to treat them, so far as salary is concerned, in the same manner that other Federal employees are treated. I can find no objection to this proposal, and for that reason I do not object to the amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. For information, I should like to ask as to compensation paid these employees. As I understand from the amendment, they are not presently under the classified service.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. Have they received pay increases within the past year or so?

Mr. HILL. No. The last pay increase which they received was the one which was given to all employees under the Classified Act and to those under civil service. They have received no special treatment, and they have received no additional increases in anyway whatever.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to state to the Senator that I feel that this is a justified amendment, and I sincerely hope that this situation will be taken care of.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the Senate adopted an amendment with regard to employees of the District of Columbia, and I believe that amendment provides for an increase of 8.8 percent. I do not think the Senate wants two different figures within the bill. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the Neely amendment providing for an increase of 8.8 percent for employees of the District be reconsidered, and that the amendment read "10 percent" instead of "8.8 percent."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Is the Senator referring to employees of the District of Columbia?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. CASE. So that what the Senator is proposing to do is to put the increase applying to them on a parity with that accorded to Federal employees?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; to make their increase the same as that of the Federal employees provided for by the bill.

Mr. CASE. Does it apply to teachers?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It applies to teachers, firemen, and policemen.

Mr. CASE. How about workers in the District Building?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They are already covered. There are some within the District who are not included.

Mr. CASE. So it will be safe to say that when the bill is completed the employees of the District of Columbia will all be treated alike. Is that statement correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I think the Senator from South Carolina offered an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON].

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I did.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It provided for an increase of \$800, or 8.8 percent, whichever is the lesser, did it not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It brought those affected under the Re-classification Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the Neely amendment was adopted. Without objection, the vote is reconsidered, and the question now is on agreeing to the amendment to the Neely amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the Neely amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I should like to explain that the bill does not affect the so-called blue-collar workers in industry. There are approximately 700,000 of them employed, and their wages are based on locally prevailing wages for similar skills in the communities in which they are employed. Their wages have kept current with the increases in wages in the local communities. That is another reason why I feel that the increase of 10 percent for the classified workers is consistent with the treatment which the 700,000 blue-collar skilled industrial workers have received.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from Oklahoma is entirely correct, and I am glad he has brought up the point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass.

The bill (S. 622) was passed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SEPARATION OF SUBSIDY FROM AIR-MAIL PAY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 436.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 436) to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 436) to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment.

PENSIONS OF CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS—VETO MESSAGE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a little while ago the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] suggested that the Senate consider the veto message in connection with House bill 3193, to establish a rate

the number of grades for the various positions under such act, to adjust the salaries of officers and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 420, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 421 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 339) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, this resolution would make in order the consideration of H. R. 339, which is a companion bill to the two measures upon which we have acted favorably here today. It provides well-merited pay increases for the Federal employees under the Classification Act of 1949, in the Foreign Service, in the department of medicine and surgery of the Veterans' Administration, in the judicial system, and in the legislative branch.

The record made by the committee and here in the debate today is replete with illustrations as to why it is good business to provide at least this amount of a pay raise. This action recom-

mended by the committee in H. R. 339 will bring the pay of classified employees into a better relation with that paid in private industry. It will help these employees meet the mounting cost of living. It will help stem the flow of personnel away from Federal employment to private industry which has been costing the Federal Government in the hiring and training thereby made necessary.

All of the arguments made in regard to the necessity for postal pay increases can be made with equal force in behalf of the classified worker. It is these arguments which prove it economical for the Congress to vote this \$417,445,600 pay increase for the 1,043,614 employees under the Classification Act and other acts included in this legislation.

Coming from the First Congressional District, which includes the high-cost living areas of Bremerton and Seattle, I could cite case upon case where workers with fixed incomes have had to seek side employment outside of the Federal Government in order to provide necessities for their families in this time of inflation. This cannot but result in decreased efficiency and the Federal Government is the loser.

In order to meet living costs, the Washington State Credit Union Examiner showed that early this year 602 Federal employees had borrowed \$21,530.32. A Federal union local survey showed that of its members 41 percent had taken additional jobs and that the same percentage of their wives had gone to work to help meet family obligations.

These facts are indications as to why in 1 month, one Federal department in the Seattle region reported 171 new appointments and 126 quits. I was unable to learn the exact cost of this employee turnover.

I do hope that no effort will be made to remove the retroactive feature of this bill. In going back merely to July 1, the bill does only partial justice for the employee has been suffering from the increased cost of living most certainly since the first of the year.

Under collective bargaining it is a custom for the employee to seek, and he usually wins, retroactive pay from the start of negotiations. We could make a good case here today, under this precedent, for the Federal pay to be retroactive to January 3, 1951, the day upon which H. R. 339 was introduced.

I urge speedy approval of this resolution and of H. R. 339. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will adopt the resolution. I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House that, when we come under the 5-minute rule, I shall offer an amendment on page 6 which refers to the Capitol Hill employees. This bill, H. R. 339, provides for a flat \$400-a-year raise. The Senate bill differs from this one in that they raise all other classified employees 10 percent with the exception of the Capitol Hill employees, and Senator MONRONEY said it was a mistake on his part when he introduced the amendment. The figure is 8.8 percent in the Senate bill. It is

my intention to introduce this amendment on page 6, section 2 (a) to correspond with the Senate bill so that the raise for the Capitol Hill employees and the legislative employees, shall be not less than \$400 or 10 percent, whichever is higher, provided that no increase shall exceed \$300 per year. That will be the same provision that is included in the Senate bill, which this will make it conform to.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members will actually take care of the people who run Capitol Hill, because there is no more loyal set of workers anywhere than the people in your own offices. They work harder than the people downtown and, without exception, every Member of this House will say that they are underpaid. They are not under civil service; you can fire them whenever you want to. They take a vacation at your discretion; they have no special privileges, no sick leave, and unless you take care of them yourselves, they will not be taken care of.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. This entire matter can be worked out in conference. There is no necessity for any amendment as proposed by my good friend from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. I want to make sure that it is taken care of.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Inadvertently the Senate limited the 8.8-percent clause for the legislative employees. It was an oversight, because all other employees were given 10 percent. This whole matter can be worked out between the conferees of the House and the Senate. The House bill provides for \$400 and the Senate bill for \$800.

Mr. SUTTON. Will the gentleman see that that is done in conference?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That will take care of that.

Mr. SUTTON. I want to make sure it is taken care of. That is the reason I shall offer my amendment.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I think the gentleman should pursue his amendment and permit the House to make that correction. I congratulate him. Let us be fair to our employees on the Hill.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I do not know whether this question has been raised, but I should like to be sure that all of our congressional employees are remembered in this bill proportionately.

Mr. SUTTON. They are, with the exception of the Members.

Mr. DINGELL. This does not apply to the Members, no. I also want to do something if it is at all possible for the District policemen, firemen, and school teachers.

Mr. SUTTON. The Committee on the District of Columbia, of which I am a member, reported out this morning a pay increase for those people,

Mr. DINGELL. That is already taken care of?

Mr. SUTTON. We reported it out of the Committee on the District of Columbia this morning.

Mr. DINGELL. I am glad to hear that, because I did not think we were justified for the sake of safeguarding any jurisdictional privilege of any committee in freezing out the District of Columbia employees. I think the sentiment on both sides of the House would sustain an immediate increase for these faithful people.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. The gentleman's amendment would apply to section 2, subsection (b), increased pay for legislative employees?

Mr. SUTTON. No, it would refer to section 2, subparagraph (a) which states:

Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of \$400 per annum.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise at this time to voice my support for this rule and for the bill which is the subject matter thereof. This bill, like the two bills we have just passed, will increase the salaries of Federal employees. I have said repeatedly that all Government employees, regardless of their classification, make up as large a group of honest, loyal, hard-working citizens as we can find anywhere. They are deserving of every possible consideration at our hands and they are entitled to the measure of increased compensation provided for by this bill, to enable them to meet in part the increased cost of living.

I have been urging increases of pay for Federal employees of all grades and classes from the lowest to the highest ever since I came to Congress, and doing it at every possible opportunity, in campaign time and out of campaign time. I have never for one moment feared that my advocacy of that cause would lose me any votes. To those who have been shrieking for economy in Government, I have consistently replied that the way to economize in Government is not by requiring Government employees to work for less than fair compensation that will give them the opportunity to maintain a decent standard of living.

Having in mind, too, much of the talk we hear today about corruption in government, let me say that the principle difference between the bad we find in government and the bad we find in private industry is that with rare exceptions, no public official is corrupt until a private citizen comes upon the scene to corrupt him. We get as good or as bad government as we deserve and as we want.

There can be no corrupt government without a corrupt citizenry.

When government will pay its employees full and fair compensation, enough for them to live on the scale at which the public expects them to live, and when the public stops calling every public official a dirty politician or a damn bureaucrat, and when the public will demand that every cheat, fraud, and briber be dealt with according to law, we will get better public officials and have a better Government. There is no doubt but that the wrongdoers in government, percentagewise and numerically, are a much smaller group than found in other walks of life, yet Mr. John Q. Public prefers to believe and to charge that all officialdom is crooked. That small part of officialdom which is crooked reflects the thinking and conduct of crooked citizens. There can be no strong government without a strong people. There can be no moral government without a moral people.

A few days ago I received a letter from one of our top Government officials, entirely unsolicited, and with no thought in mind by him that what he wrote to me might be used in connection with this bill. He tells the story so well that I cannot let this opportunity go by without reading these short excerpts from his letter:

I agree with you entirely that the loss to the Government is as great or greater from being unable to hold employees once trained than from failure to attract personnel from private industry for top jobs.

Employment in the Government has many compensations, particularly to those of us who are privileged to occupy positions of authority. The high purpose and degree of responsibility associated with most of our work, the variety of experience, and the personal and official relationships involved, truly are, as it is said, "more than money can buy."

I also agree, therefore, that it is not entirely relevant to draw comparisons from private industry in determining the proper compensation for Federal officials. It is, however, clearly necessary and appropriate to offer such compensation as will provide for a reasonable rising standard of living at all levels of responsibility. While that would fall far short of the financial standard for success in private industry, it would substantially minimize the undesirable pressure on experienced employees to leave the Government.

"We will have a better Government if we render to Government employees and officials the respect that is their due, and if we tender to them the compensation that is their right. It may be true that no one has a right to work for the Government and no one need work for the Government unless he wants to, but neither Government nor the citizens that make up the Government have any right to expect anyone to serve them without adequate compensation.

(Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am for the measure increasing the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government. I believe it will aid deserving employees,

and in a measure will offset the greatly increased cost-of-living expenses incurred due to inflation.

I do feel that our legislative employees should be included, too.

(Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Washington has explained, House Resolution 421 makes in order H. R. 339, a bill to adjust the compensation of the classified workers of the Federal Government.

This measure, as has been mentioned by the gentleman from Tennessee, also carries a provision which would increase the compensation of legislative employees. However, I want to make it very clear, for the record, that this legislation does not in any way increase the compensation which is paid or is presumed to be paid to the Members of Congress. The salaries of the Members of Congress are in no way affected by this legislation.

This bill is somewhat different from the companion bill that was passed earlier today for the benefit of postal employees. It is also different from the measure which passed the other body to adjust the compensation of classified employees of the Government. The bill on this same subject, which passed the other body provides for a 10-percent increase for classified workers but, as the gentleman from Tennessee has pointed out, carries an increase of only 8.4 percent for legislative employees.

The bill affecting postal workers, which passed the other body, and the one which passed this House a little earlier today, contains a minimum increase of \$400 for each employee. This House bill carries a \$400 minimum increase for classified employees but provides no percentage increase as in the Senate bill on the same subject. In other words, the Senate bill for classified workers has no \$400 minimum increase, but simply a 10-percent increase. This bill contains a \$400 flat pay increase, but does not provide the 10-percent increase. Therefore, it will certainly be necessary to adjust the differences in the two measures between the two bodies, which I am sure will be done.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. I compliment the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] for proposing to introduce an amendment which would adjust the differences between the two Houses. I would like to be sure that our Congressional employees get as much of a raise as anyone else in the Federal Government because they do as much work, if not more.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I take it then, that my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, would like to see a minimum of \$400 provided for the classified employees in the

lower brackets, and at the same time in the interest of fairness to recognize those employees in the higher brackets by a fair percentage increase in their salaries. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It seems to me that if legislation is enacted which contains a floor or a minimum increase of \$400 for one group of Government employees, and a greater increase of up to \$800 through a percentage formula, that the same provision should be carried for the benefit of all workers in the Government.

Mr. DINGELL. I understand the gentleman correctly, do I not, in that assumption?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; I think there has to be some sort of floor provided for.

Mr. DINGELL. I think it is entirely fair and ought to be applied in this instance.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does this \$400 increase affect the base pay of legislative employees?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No; I understand that the \$400 increase provided in this bill will be added to the present total compensation received by the employee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do the percentage figures put in apply to the base pay or to the total?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As I understand it, the percentage figure would apply, as it is now applied in the Senate bill, to the pay and the actual amount received, and not to the base pay.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and yield back the balance of my time.

(Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 339) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 339, with Mr. GATHINGS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

(Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this bill covers about 1,044,000 employees. It includes all classified civil-service employees, of whom there are about 1,000,000. Then there are about 44,000 additional employees, in addition to the 1,000,000 classified employees covered by this bill, who are not civil-service employees. They comprise physicians, dentists, nurses, and other employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration; also the Foreign Service employees; secretaries and law clerks of the United States circuit court and district court judges, and the legislative employees of Congress.

Now, this is a very simple bill. It provides that every employee included under this bill shall receive a salary increase of \$400; no more and no less. In other words, an employee in the lowest salary bracket will receive \$400, and an employee in the highest bracket will receive \$400. This bill does not have the endorsement of the Civil Service Commission or the President. The President said that this bill was wrong because it was not on a percentage basis. He said it would distort the classification fixture and give all employees, from bottom to top, the same amount. Well, that is true. It does do that. But the committee saw fit to bring out this kind of a bill during my absence due to illness.

The cost of the bill is \$417,000,000. I do not think there is any controversy about the bill. This legislation will finally have to be worked out in conference.

The other body passed a bill which would give a percentage increase of 10 percent to all employees, with a maximum of \$800. This bill only gives \$400 to everyone included. So naturally this bill will have to be worked out in conference, and the differences between the Senate and the House adjusted.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Did the gentleman say that this bill would add \$417,000,000 to the Federal payroll?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is exactly correct. The three bills that have been before the House today will cost a total of \$675,000,000.

I would have offered an amendment to strike out the retroactive date to July 1, provided a similar amendment had been adopted to the postal employees pay bill. But in view of the fact that the House saw fit not to adopt my amendment to strike out the retroactive date to July 1, 1951, I will not offer such an amendment to this bill, because certainly all employees should be treated the same about the effective date of the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. What does subsection E mean on page 5 of the bill? The last paragraph on page 5.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. It speaks for itself.

Mr. RABAUT. Well, then, do I understand correctly that the agencies of Government must save the money out of their appropriation to pay the pay increases.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. RABAUT. You mean they must save the money out of their appropriation to pay these increases?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct. I will say to the gentleman that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] is the author of that section, and he can explain it to you as it was adopted by the committee in my absence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is an extremely important piece of legislation. I suggested earlier in the day that we had spent a considerable amount of time arguing, trying to determine whether we should charge some \$12,000,000 to a group who used the mail service, or whether we would just go ahead and charge it to the taxpayers. It took us all day to decide that. We are now going to spend in a short time the item of something over \$417,000,000, and I think it is extremely important that we at least know what we are doing.

This bill does affect more than a million employees; it affects all persons employed by the United States Government except those in the wage boards and those in the postal service, for which legislation has already been approved. This legislation, as our chairman has told you, comes to the floor with the recommendation of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, but it also should be explained that it does not have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget; neither does it have the approval of the Civil Service Commission. So far as this House is concerned we are on our own; it is for us to decide whether we want to approve this legislation or not, as it should be. But I think that situation ought to be pointed out. This bill provides for an increase of \$400 for each and every one of the 1,044,000-plus employees and those who have already been described to you by the chairman of this committee.

This legislation comes before you after a considerable amount of discussion and long hearings. It was determined, as I told you before with respect to postal employees, that if this is a cost-of-living proposal, which I think it is, then all Government employees should be treated alike in that respect; so that is what this committee proposed to do. The other body in giving consideration to similar legislation put a floor or minimum of \$400 for these Federal employees, and a maximum of \$800; otherwise 10 percent.

Here is an analysis of the bill:

Coverage: One million and forty-four thousand employees, including, first, classified employees; second, physicians, dentists, nurses, and other employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, Veterans' Administration; third,

Foreign Service employees; fourth, secretaries and law clerks of the United States circuit and district court judges; and fifth, legislative employees.

Salary increase: An increase of \$400—20 cents an hour for hourly or part-time employees—in basic compensation, subject to retirement deductions and used as a basis upon which to compute overtime and night differential.

Increased annual cost: Four hundred and seventeen million dollars.

Effective date: The first pay period following June 30, 1951, except that no retroactive compensation or salary shall be payable to any individual not in the service of the United States—including the Armed Forces—or the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment, other than those who retire during such period.

Other provisions: Section 1 (d) amends the Classification Act of 1949 to provide that increases in compensation granted employees by law after June 30, 1951, shall not operate to deprive such employees of within-grade salary advancements under the Classification Act.

Section 1 (e) provides that except for the field service of the Post Office Department, and in those cases where the President determines a department or individual establishment, or any part thereof, is engaged in activities essential to the national defense, the departments and agencies in the executive branch shall absorb the increased cost of the salary increases within the appropriation or funds made available to such department or agency for personal services for fiscal year 1952.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield briefly.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Does not the gentleman from Kansas feel that the AAA or the PMA employees in the States who are really Federal employees under the Department of Agriculture and who were not included should be included too, for the raise?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I may say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that no one appeared before the committee that I know about, unless it was the gentleman from Oklahoma himself, in support of his proposal. I may say that the committee did not give consideration to that question because as he just stated there is a question as to whether you designate them as Federal employees or partial State employees. I would say to the gentleman, however, that they ought to be compensated for the services they render in line with the compensation paid by the Federal Government.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am somewhat uncertain as to just how this operates as far as the legislative employees are concerned. For instance, this applies to those who are presently on the payroll. It does not affect the base, I am informed.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It does not affect the base; it simply means that if you have someone on the payroll who is presently getting \$3,000 you add \$400.

It is for you to decide what the employee ought to receive; that is an adjustment you make because that adjustment is under your control. To whatever you allow a person who is employed by you there is added an additional \$400 under this legislation. There is no percentage basis attached to it at all.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does it follow from that in the event additional legislative employees come onto the payroll after the enactment of this bill that they, too, get the \$400?

Mr. REES of Kansas. You would go down there and fix the salary that the individual is to receive. When you have talked to the Disbursement Office and determined what the salary shall be as it is presently fixed, there will be added to that \$400, but you do not take that into consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Will this amount be added to the base we are allowed for secretarial service?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It will be added to the amount the Member is allowed for employee hire.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Then it will vary with each office.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That depends upon yourself. If you go down there and figure out that you are going to pay your employees \$2,700 base pay, or whatever it is called, then there will be a percentage added, as is done presently. In other words your base pay is not what the employee gets, as you know, but there are additions. After the complex computations have been made, then there will be an additional \$400 added to that amount; is that clear?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, a moment ago I stated this legislation does not have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. The report from the Bureau of the Budget is that the increase should be at the rate of 7 percent. The same thing is true with respect to the Civil Service Commission, except there is an adjustment there of between 7 and 7.5 percent.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Are the employees of the District of Columbia, including policemen, firemen, and teachers, in this bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I should have mentioned that. We had them in the bill originally, then afterwards, at the request of members of the committee who were also members of the District of Columbia Committee they were withdrawn. I want to make that correction in my statement.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In our committee this morning and tomorrow we are going to try to decide that question relative to the policemen, firemen, teachers and other employees of the District of Columbia.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The employees of the District of Columbia were included in the bill originally, but at the request of two or three members of our committee who are also members of the District of Columbia Committee that por-

tion of the bill was stricken out with the understanding that the Committee on the District of Columbia will provide and support legislation on this subject matter.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. If we do not have a particular employee on our legislative payroll now but we appoint a person we will say one day after this act becomes effective, does that person then get the benefit of the \$400 increase?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Certainly, yes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Will the gentleman explain to me the acrobatics of the Corbett concoction in this bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think I shall have to agree with the chairman of my committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania submitted that proposal. It was his hope that the situation could be worked out whereby these agencies might, even though they pay more in salaries, employ a less number of employees. But again I think it is only fair that the gentleman from Pennsylvania explain that proposal himself.

Mr. RIVERS. If we keep in here the Corbett idea you cannot raise anybody anything?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It just depends upon whether or not the agency can get along with less employees. There are quite a number of agencies that are pretty well overstaffed. I suppose we will have a question of whether or not a certain agency is overstaffed and another one not overstaffed. That is a problem to be worked out. But again I will leave it to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] to explain himself.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Suppose you have four people on your staff in the office one day after this bill goes into effect and you employ a fifth secretary; does that fifth secretary get the salary that you fix plus the \$400 provided in this bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct. You go down there and fix the salary at the disbursement office, if you want to put it that way. There is that \$400 to be added to it, or, putting it another way, if you decide to pay the individual \$4,000 certainly you will take into consideration the fact that you have \$400 more down there to pay that employee. Is that clear?

Mr. DONDERO. It is clear.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If your decision is not to raise the pay of any of your employees, yet you have the \$400 for four employees, \$1,600, to use if you so desire or to turn back?

Mr. REES of Kansas. You do not have to use it. You can turn it back.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If your decision is not to raise the salaries of your employees, if you make an agree-

ment or have an understanding as to the pay for the year and decide not to give them the \$400, can you do that under this bill, or not?

Mr. REES of Kansas. You will have to go down to the Disbursing Office and readjust the amount you will allow that individual, otherwise he will automatically get the \$400.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Then you will have \$1,600 to put somebody else on the pay roll, if you desire.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct. Before closing I want to call attention again to the fact that the government is higher than ever before and that employees are being hired at the rate of 1,500 a week, and the end is not yet.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of giving all Federal employees the same pay boost that we have given to the postal employees. In the original bill as introduced, H. R. 339, a 17 percent increase was proposed. Chairman Ramspeck of the Civil Service Commission testified that he felt a 20 to 25 percent increase was necessary in order to bring rates up to the increased cost of living. I hope that this bill will be approved, with one exception. I think we should strike out paragraph "e" on page 5 starting on line 19.

What this paragraph "e" really means is that you take away the increase called for in this bill. You say that no additional appropriation shall be made to the various departments. So you are voting for an increase but you are not giving it to those employees. I think it is unfair. I think it is unsound. If we are going to treat all the Federal employees in the same way, this provision should be taken out. I intend to introduce an amendment to do so.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Would this provision apply to the employees in the Legislative branch?

Mr. RHODES. Yes.

Mr. CANFIELD. Then there would be no resultant increase?

Mr. RHODES. There would be no increase, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. Is the gentleman talking about section (e)?

Mr. RHODES. Yes.

Mr. CORBETT. That applies only to the executive branch. It says so in the language.

Mr. RHODES. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. CORBETT. You will find it on page 5 and following. It is only applicable to the executive branch and only applicable to the nondefense agencies, and not to the postmasters.

Mr. RHODES. I think that every department of government should be treated the same way. Certainly the

employees in the executive department deserve the same kind of treatment as the employees of any other department.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Then if you think all should be treated alike, would you not be in favor, in conference, of allowing the State AAA or PMA agricultural officials to have the same rate of increase?

Mr. RHODES. I think they are entitled to it also.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES. I want to say also that I believe that all Federal employees, including District employees, should be given the same increase. The provision to include District employees was in the bill, but it was taken out at a meeting of the committee at the request of members of the District Committee. I would favor an amendment adopted to have the District employees included in this bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, we have just passed two bills to increase the salaries of postal employees and the postmasters and other supervisors. In neither of those bills were there any limitations such as have been imposed in this bill by paragraph (e) which appears on page 5 of the bill and runs over onto page 6. The sum and substance of this paragraph is that after providing an increase for the Federal employees other than those of the Post Office Department, who have already been taken care of, we do not give them the increase unless savings can be made out of money already appropriated except in those departments or agencies which the President determines to be engaged in activities essential to the national defense. We further exempt the Post Office Department in itself. In other words, this section shall not apply to the field service of the Post Office Department, so that is exempt. Then the paragraph further says that it shall not apply to any department or independent establishment, or any part thereof, which the President determines to be engaged in activities essential to the national defense.

In other words, we say, "We are increasing your salary," and then by this language we say to those agencies or departments that the President does not determine to be essential to the national defense, "We are not increasing your salary." What hypocrisy.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. I believe the gentleman misunderstands the language of the provision because it makes the increase mandatory for the individual employee but requires that it be accomplished within the existing budget of the nondefense agency to this effect, that the

agency head, at the time when people voluntarily separate themselves from the service, has, let us say, \$100,000 to use for these increases.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand.

Mr. CORBETT. Is it clear, however, that the raise is mandatory for the individual?

Mr. McCORMACK. Under the language of this bill, I cannot see how any head of an agency can carry out this provision. If you give increases you have to make large reductions in the number of employees. For example, the budget estimate for the Civil Service Commission was \$23,000,000 and it finally received \$17,500,000. Under this bill the increase would be about \$1,800,000. Giving that \$1,800,000 increase would have to be done within the present appropriation. No deficiency or supplemental appropriation can be asked for because that is prohibited by the language of paragraph (e). They would have to reduce the number of their employees sharply in order to give the increase provided in this bill. We already have the Jensen amendment which provides for reductions. I cannot in all honesty see how any department head can accomplish it.

Certainly the Interior Department could not be considered essential to national defense. Parts of it could be so considered, but I doubt if the over-all department could be considered as essential to national defense. I doubt if the Department of Commerce as a whole could be considered as essential to national defense. I doubt if the General Accounting Office as a whole could be considered as essential to national defense. I doubt if the Civil Service Commission as a whole could be considered as essential to the national defense. There are other agencies that certainly no man, you or I or the President, could determine to be essential to the national defense to make them exempt so that they could ask for a supplemental or deficiency appropriation in order to meet the increase provided for in this bill.

Therefore, by reason of paragraph (e), I find myself in the position of saying to 1,044,000 employees, whom the chairman refers to as being benefited by this bill, through getting this increase, "I am voting for your increase, but in the case of a great majority of you I am not voting for this increase by reason of this language in the bill."

I submit that there is no other construction that can be placed upon paragraph (e) on page 5 other than that a very substantial number of the 1,044,000 employees who expect under this bill to get an increase are not in fact going to get an increase.

Mr. Chairman, there is one more thought which I wanted to discuss, getting away from the subject at hand entirely. Here we are, 435 Members of the House of Representatives, and 96 Members of the Senate. Our salary is \$12,500 with a \$2,500 expense account. I think it is unfortunate that we do not give a little consideration to our salaries. The people of your district, and the peo-

ple of my district, want us to be independent. They do not want us, or expect us, to be here in Washington where many of us, who do not have some kind of outside, independent income, are overspending or spending more than we receive through salaries and our expense account. I realize that so far as our salaries are concerned, probably an amendment to this bill might be subject to a point of order. On various occasions I have said that the salary of a Member of Congress ought to be at least \$25,000 a year. I have the courage to vote for an increase for myself as a legislator and I know my colleagues have. We are giving increases to the postal employees, which they deserve, both in the supervisory positions and the nonsupervisory positions, and we are giving increases to employees covered by this bill—and properly so. I think we ought to consider ourselves also. I hope the appropriate committee of the Congress, between now and next January, or in the early part of the next session will approach this question and report a bill. So far as I am concerned, I am prepared to vote for a \$25,000 salary for myself. I have the courage to do it—we all have, I know—I am not picking myself out as the individual with the courage to do so. But, we ought to do it, and the people of our districts will support us. I hope that will be done at the next session of the Congress.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, in regard to this controversial section E, I must submit I believe the gentleman who preceded me has placed a false interpretation on the language—not deliberately, of course.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, will he say incorrect instead of false?

Mr. CORBETT. Yes—incorrect—I was going to modify my statement as the gentleman rose to his feet.

Mr. Chairman, according to the language of this amendment, where it provides that the increase must be accomplished within the budget, except for those agencies exempted by the language, it means in effect that the head of the agency, as the head of a business might be required to do, is allowed so many millions of dollars for employee hire and that is all the money that he can expend. It is very natural to assume that under the provisions of the Jensen-Ferguson amendment, and under what we could well expect under the dictums of the Budget Bureau, that this increase could be accomplished without increasing the budget for the agency. The gentleman said he could not see how any other interpretation could be placed upon it. Therefore, I would like him to attend to this. We now have a definite rate of attrition in our agencies of something over 12½ percent of the employees. This language would prevent some rehiring. It would prevent some replacement of people who voluntarily separate themselves from the service or who are deceased. So for those of us who want to accomplish this raise, and at the same

time have some regard for economy, we felt that this language would accomplish those objectives.

Mr. McCORMACK. Why did you not put it in the postal pay-increase bill? I would have been against it, but why did you not put it in there?

Mr. CORBETT. I believe for the same reason that the Post Office Department was exempted under the Jensen amendment. We think they have insufficient personnel to perform the expanding service.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman says that through attrition it would be accomplished. Well, I would not agree to that if it was in there. But if the gentleman says that as employees terminate their service there would be nobody appointed until their is absorption, then the gentleman would be on more tenable ground. I personally would not agree to it, but once this becomes law the increase is mandatory. How are you going to do it unless they fire a lot of their help?

Mr. CORBETT. I am very happy to answer the gentleman. I think as he thinks this through his opposition may not be so extreme. Rather than have the automatic provisions of the Jensen-Ferguson compromise applied, this allows an agency head to replace, if he wants to, some individuals. He has a budget to operate within. Under the Jensen-Ferguson amendment, if four of his top officials quit he can only replace one. This would allow him to rehire or fire as long as he stays within the terms of the budget.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman makes reference to the Jensen-Ferguson amendment and says this will take care of that, because this is a cut in personnel. The gentleman forgets that the provisions of the Jensen-Ferguson amendment require a reduction in appropriation. In my opinion, what you are doing is reducing the appropriation some more, and therefore blindly cutting the employees in their activity. How are you going to do that?

Mr. CORBETT. I cannot yield much more, but this does not cut the appropriation 5 cents. I make no pretense about it, but it does cut the size of the payroll.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. You must realize that 3 months of the fiscal year have already expired. They are operating on a normal basis. You see how much more difficult it would make it for them to comply.

Mr. CORBETT. I would agree with the gentleman that if the provision remains as it is, we should make allowance in conference for the fact that a period of time has gone by.

Mr. BAILEY. It would be just impossible to carry it out.

Mr. CORBETT. I believe very definitely that this bill, including this

amendment, accomplishes this situation, that we do grant an increased salary to all Federal employees; that we provide further that it be accomplished within the existing budget for those agencies not exempted; and I believe the final result of that will be that we will have a reduction in the Federal payroll and we will have improved salaries for those presently employed, and result in better paid and better qualified employees.

I urge the retention of the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about this revised edition of the Jensen amendment that is in this bill.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. It is a supplemental Jensen amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. Supplemental and revised; and in my opinion it is quite clever, too clever for the number of people involved, who we talk about in this House as the faithful employees of the Government. Too clever, entirely. It is one of those deals that most people do not like.

How are you going to make it retroactive? That language is in here. You have got to fool around with this thing. Talk about tweedledee and tweedledum. You have it here. Nobody understands it. You want to pay them. You order them paid.

It reminds me of the old Latin saying "Nemo dat quid non habet," you cannot give what you do not have. The heads of these departments cannot give it either.

I am surprised to find this language in this bill; it certainly should have the consideration of every fair-thinking person in this House. If you want to trim somebody come out, use your pencil and trim him; do not put it in here by language of this kind that must be discovered on the floor.

I hope this language from line 19, page 5, down to and including line 6 on page 8 will be stricken from this bill in justice to the people who serve and work for the Government.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Michigan and the majority leader for noticing this shell game in this bill. Frankly it reminds me of the conversation between Amos and Andy. Andy was sued. Amos said "What are you sued for?" He said: "On this contract." "Well," he said, "Andy, let me see that contract." Andy showed it to him and he said, "You is stuck." He asked "How so I am stuck?" Amos said, "Always remember, in a contract the big letters gives you something, but the little ones takes it all away."

You are giving these fellows something in these bills, but through the ingenuity of the gentleman from Pennsylvania you have taken it all away.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes; I yielded to the gentleman for about 8 months, but it is still just as clear as mud to me after all that interval.

Mr. CORBETT. Certainly the gentleman and farmer should be out of the mud, but get this part clear, because the misunderstanding comes from the other side.

The salary increase is absolutely mandatory. What is required is that the agency within the amount of money appropriated to it shall provide the increase, and it can be accomplished by not filling vacancies and as a result of attrition in the department. It does not affect the very large percentage of the employees because of the exemptions provided in the bill. Whether the gentleman is for the section or not, it does provide the increase and makes it mandatory.

Mr. BURDICK. No; I still say it is a shell game.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania how many employees he seeks to fire, not to get an increase? He does not ask for an increase in this language at all; what he is asking is this, he says: "We will give you the money you had before and fire the people we are pretending we give a raise to at this time." That is the language exactly.

Mr. CORBETT. That is the confusion that rules on the other side.

Mr. RABAUT. There is no confusion. We have discovered what the gentleman attempted to do and we are bringing it to light.

Mr. BURDICK. I did not intend to start a row between you fellows. Let me finish my own fight.

For the Department of Agriculture you have provided a certain amount of money for the payment of employees in that department. That is done by the Committee on Appropriations. This bill raises the salary of everybody in the employ of the Department of Agriculture, but they cannot use any money unless they save it out of what the bill has provided. There will be nobody hired unless they can steal it from somebody else or fire somebody else. Now, that is what it means; and when you go to court with this you cannot fool the court by slippery argument; that is what it means. You can hire all the people you want to in the Department of the Interior provided you do not pay out any more money than the appropriations Congress gave that Department. So where are you going to raise the salary of anybody?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman's own interpretation is to this effect, that they increase the salary of some employees and take it away altogether from others.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SASSCER. As I understand from what the gentleman says, this amendment would have exactly the same effect as was the case in connection with the raise in the naval establishment about 2 years ago, in which the employees were given an hourly raise but they had to absorb it in their budget. It resulted in the drastic discharge of employees to make up for the raise of the others.

Mr. BURDICK. The reason I appear here is to speak on this amendment. I talked once today and I do not like to monopolize the time. But I hate to see the Federal employees of this Government fooled by reading in the newspapers that their salaries have been increased when we sit here and pass an act that will prevent them from receiving any money. That is the wrong way to legislate and I am not for that kind of legislation.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, since I am the only Member of the Eighty-second Congress who has not spoken today I think I ought to get my name in the RECORD before the sun sets. I am going to pay my respects to this amendment. I call this a hocus-pocus amendment. It is like that piece of poetry which comes to my feeble mind:

Mama, may I take a swim?

Yes, my darling daughter; hang whatever you have on whatever limb you have, but don't get near the water.

My friend over there has performed a masterly piece of legislative surgery. He has told them to put everybody they want on the payroll but do not pay them. Increase their salary, but do not pay them. That is what I call legislative tight-rope walking.

It reminds me of the man who could ride two horses going in the opposite direction at the same time. I do not possess that faculty; therefore true to my wonderful record, which you know I have built up in this Congress, I am against it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG].

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I am not authorized to speak for any member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, but I think it is only fair to say on behalf of all of us that when this provision was under discussion in our committee nobody raised the point that this provision was put into the bill as a clever arrangement. I am sure the gentleman who used that expression repeatedly that this was "too clever" did not mean that that was the intention of any member of this committee.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RHODES. Is it not true that in the committee there was a controversy?

I opposed this in the committee and I know other members did. It seems to me the vote on that proposal was 9 to 6.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I will accept the gentleman's figures in regard to it, but no one questioned the motives of those supporting this proposal as indicating a desire to cover up something. So far as I am concerned, as one member of that committee, I thought it was simply a necessary device to bring about at least some economies in the agencies of this Government.

I do not care as to the wording that might be used, and I do not have any brief for or against the wording of this proposal, but I do believe that if this proposition in this same wording or some other, were put up to the voters of my district in Missouri, they would approve it heartily. I think we have been generous here, certainly, with the postal employees, and it was our intention to be equally generous with the employees of the other agencies. I do not believe any member of the committee will dispute that.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. The Bureau—and I wish the gentleman would note this point—estimated that this bill as written would cost \$417,000,000. Now, then, granting \$417,000,000 additional salary does not mean giving them something and taking it away.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to point out further that mention has been made that this provision would put a brake on the overstaffing of the agencies of our Government. I believe that any agency of our Government could get along with less personnel than are now employed. One of the gentlemen mentioned the Department of the Interior. Why, bless your souls, you could make a study of the Department of the Interior, and on that, or any study that has already been made, you could save 25 percent of the appropriations now being made to that Department and not hurt a single needed service of that agency. I do not care how we arrive at this thing, but I believe that everyone of us in our desire to be generous to our Federal employees has in mind also the necessity to put a brake sometime on this overstaffing of employees.

In order to make a study of that quite recently, I talked to a few selected employees of one of our agencies. One employee—and I shall not call his name—said to me, "They are having difficulty in finding 2 hours of work for me to do in any day of the week." He said, "I could point to dozens of my associates in my division that are in the same situation as I am. We have practically nothing to do."

We are not trying to penalize anyone. As a matter of fact, I would like to see the old-line employees, the ones that have been on the payroll a long time, treated decently with a proper increase instead of just taking new employees on and on. If the wording of this proposal

will accomplish that, I think to that extent it will accomplish what our fine chairman has been pleading for, that in all of our generosity we at least begin to put some limit on the overstaffing. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania that this might result in fewer, but certainly better, employees.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is there anything in the language which has been so bitterly criticized, and perhaps unjustly criticized, which would take a penny of wages or salary from anyone who remained on the payroll?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Not a single one.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is there anything in the language that would provoke the agency in firing any employee?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Not at all, unless, of course, it were necessary, but I do not believe it was the intention of the committee to bring about any firing. We are trying to set the brake on overstaffing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman tell me for my own edification that if they do not fire anybody, if they do not reduce the force in any manner, where there is going to be any saving? Mind you, the phraseology of this thing, as I understand, is that they will be paid their increase out of the departmental savings. Now you tell me where and how, without reducing the employees on the force, there is going to be any saving to pay these employees the additional amount that we propose to give them in this bill. It cannot be done if this remains in the bill. We trick these employees into believing they will get something that they will not, or we will have to strike it out of the bill and give them what we gave other employees. I am in favor of striking it out.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Let me answer the gentleman as best I can. Certainly I, as one Member of this body, would be the last to want to trick any of our employees, as the gentleman knows. A great many savings can be made in other ways than through the pay of personnel. There is not a single agency but what could save enough to pay the increases required in this bill. There will be resignations. There is a heavy turnover in many agencies as the gentleman knows. I think this provision would, at least, stimulate savings which will be required under this proposal. Thus it would permit the agencies to go ahead and pay the raises required by this bill.

Mr. DINGELL. But the gentleman will concede that if you do not reduce the personnel a sufficient number there will be no increase?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. No, I do not concede that.

Mr. CORBETT. The gentleman should know that there is a 12½ percent turnover normally.

Mr. DINGELL. That does not mean that you can fire that many.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, in these brief 2 minutes I do not desire to impugn the motives of the gentleman from Pennsylvania or his associates on the committee. I do question their judgment. His proposition might have had some fairness about it had it applied to July 1, but I want to remind the gentleman that over 2 months of the fiscal year have already expired. This proposition is retroactive to the 1st of July on these employees. That simply means that one-fourth of the ability of that department head to meet this requirement has been removed by the fact that it is retroactive and by the fact that almost 3 months of the fiscal year have expired.

There is one other thing to which I want to call the gentleman's attention. We forced some retrenchment in the present administration of some of the executive departments, including the Veterans' Administration. They were forced to let out several thousand employees as the result of that. Let me tell the gentleman what is happening. Fifteen hundred of those are in the city of Washington. What is happening? One's and two's and three's and four's are being discharged. Did you ever hear tell of a 9, 10, or 11 being discharged by the Veterans' Administration? They have supervisors down there with 6 or 7 ratings, supervising 4 or 6 or 8 of the classifications of 2's and 3's. If you are going to do anything, why do you not go up there and designate who is to be fired and get rid of some of this overstaffing in those higher classifications? What you are going to do down here now is take a job away from some people who have to have it to exist, and you will not change the situation up in the higher brackets at all. It is silly to talk about it.

[Mr. WERDEL addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlemen from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on paragraph E, on page 5, because of some of my experience. I am only doing so because I had the privilege of being an administrator of a Federal program. I would like to say to you what I think this does. I know every Member of the House, in spite of some things that have been said to the contrary, is interested in economy and efficiency in our Government. You want to be from the letters you get from the people back home, whom you represent. This proposal has been put before you on the basis of your interest in economy and efficiency, and in the belief that it is economy to effectuate these savings by raising the salaries of many of the worthy Federal employees.

All of us who have had contact with Federal employees know that we have a

splendid group, by and large, in our Federal service. But at the same time you see that what we are going to do is to say to the administrators of these programs, "You must pay this salary out of the money which has been appropriated."

I had a little experience with something that happened a few years ago. The appropriations were a little slow coming out, as they are this year. It is most difficult for a Federal agency to decide upon what they shall do with their budget until they finally get it. This year we are one-quarter of the year along, and some of the departments do not know yet what they are going to have in their budgets. This salary increase is mandatory. The budget officer will sit down and say, "The salary increase is mandatory." The administrator of the program will immediately distribute, to the best of his ability, the funds that are required for the salary increase, and send out separation notices. What about service? You will have services curtailed, because their personnel has been limited.

In my particular instance in protecting the budget, it meant that more notices were sent out than were required to have been sent out at the end of the year, because we did not know at that time how many resignations there would be. We did not know how many people would leave, so that we must send out enough notices to protect the budget that was set up. It was amazing to find how many of those employees that were separated found other jobs immediately. Frankly, I thought it would be difficult for them, but it was not. In my department we dismissed 45 percent, and every one of those employees found a job. It must have been a better job, because later on, when we tried to bring those trained people back, they would not come back. That was not a saving to the Department to lose experienced personnel, many trained by the Government. I have never met a Federal administrator who has not told me that he could effectuate some savings in his department if he were given the latitude to decide who he might dismiss on the separation register. Unfortunately, there are people who are drones upon our payrolls. Because of Federal regulations, Civil Service regulations, it is almost impossible to dismiss an incompetent person. I would like to say to my good friend from Missouri, who gave a very fine explanation on the floor of this House a moment ago in connection with the attempt to bring about efficiency in Government, that I envy him in his position as a member of the great Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, because you have it in your hands to bring about some of these improvements of Federal regulations, that will give some authority to some of the administrators of our program. I agree that in the matter of economy and efficiency there must be something done in fairness to the people who pay taxes to arrive at that very thing. But you are not doing it. You are doing the very opposite of what you intend to do, if you are thinking of economy and efficiency of service, when you

put in a particular provision such as that contained in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time in general debate.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on this bill, but since a controversy has arisen over the provisions of paragraph E on page 5, I feel compelled to speak. It seems to me this is a very wise provision that the committee has written into this measure. If it is properly administered it will not create an unsatisfactory situation, but instead will be very beneficial, not only to our Federal Treasury but also to the deserving employees of the Government.

In the first place let me remind you that there is a turn-over in the personnel of these departments of the Government of anywhere from 10 to as high as 50 percent each year in some classifications.

Let me also remind you, if I may, that we have seen a tremendous increase and growth in the number of Federal civilian employees in the last year or so, that at the present time we now have over 2,500,000 civilian employees on the Federal payroll, and that in the last year we have had a steady increase of as many as 2,000 new employees added each day to the payroll.

I spent something like 2 years as a member of the Hoover Commission, during which we devoted a great deal of attention to the study of personnel problems. We found in department after department great overstaffing, just as did a subcommittee under the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAMS], named by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and authorized by this House to conduct an investigation of overstaffing. They found much overstaffing and so reported to this body. The Hoover Commission not only found overstaffing, but we also found in department after department what they call a dead-letter office where, because of the peculiarities of civil-service laws and regulations which make it almost impossible for the head of a department or a supervisor to get rid of an unsatisfactory employee, that they moved the unsatisfactory employees over into this dead-letter office or section, where they are doing very little worthwhile or beneficial work. I remember an important member of the Cabinet telling us in executive session that he had nearly 10,000 employees in his department he could get along without if he could get rid of them easily. So I do not think this provision of the bill is going to work any hardship on any deserving employee. Compensate fairly and, if necessary, even liberally those who actually carry the burden of work and are doing the job. Let us give the executive officers the right and the opportunity to get rid of the drones, the troublemakers, and the shirks; save

what they can by such dismissals and then grant fair pay to those who earn it.

If we keep this provision in the bill the result will be fewer employees in the Government departments, but better employees and more efficient employees, fairly compensated for what they do; and the Government will be better off. We have already provided for a reduction of personnel by the Jensen amendments to other legislation. Why back down by adopting this amendment after marching up the hill?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure the gentleman feels exactly as most Members of the House feel, and as I do, that since this Congress will appropriate over \$10,000,000,000 for civilian personnel for the fiscal year 1952 there is sufficient money appropriated already to take care of the needs of the Federal employees.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman fully. What I want to see done, and what I hope this House will do, is the passage of legislation that will give to the deserving workers of the Government the compensation they need to meet the increased cost of living, and that we pay the cost thereof through the elimination from the payroll of unneeded workers or by not filling jobs as they become vacant, when it is not necessary to fill them.

In other words with one hand we can and should give fair treatment and fair compensation to deserving workers, and with the other hand we can save the money to meet the cost thereof. That to me just makes good common sense. That is what we ought to do, and that is what I hope we will do.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Does this legislation here offer the opportunity to get rid of the drones? We are not correcting the procedure, are we?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Of course, any official or any supervisor worthy of his salt, armed with this law, will immediately move to get rid of the drones and the troublemakers. That is where he can and should move in. He will also probably have enough people resigning their jobs to take care of the required reduction in personnel.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me when I say that this element of drones which exists is something that grew up within the civil service.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. DINGELL. And ought to be uprooted. But it is something this will

not reach. I say to my friend that the supervisory official in a department when he runs into one of these absolutely useless individuals, under the civil service regulations he cannot remove them.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, now, the gentleman is usually right, but not always.

Mr. DINGELL. Something should be done about it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the law as passed by the Congress today tells the public official he must reduce personnel in certain cases, he may use his judgment in making that reduction under the law, and that judgment should be exercised against the drones and the unsatisfactory employees.

Mr. DINGELL. I am sorry, but I have to disagree with my friend on his interpretation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I too am sorry if the gentleman has a different opinion. But I insist if the Congress, by a law passed subsequent to other laws requires the reduction, then they will have the authority to reduce the number of employees.

Mr. DINGELL. But not the drones.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I had not intended to say anything on this bill, but the gentleman is speaking on a subject I have given quite a bit of thought to. It has been emphasized by certain people who have come to my office stating they have been here for months as stenographers. They have gone to school to acquire that art. They have not even yet had a machine to work on, they have had no dictation, and they were going home to save the art of taking dictation. I had a man come in and state that he had drawn \$2,800 from the Government and he said, "I have never done 1 cent of work."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I say to the gentleman quickly, the report came to me of an employee of the Federal Government who was recently hired on a standby basis to take a job. He received his compensation while awaiting call. He was sort of stockpiled. He had done nothing, for he had not been called to active duty, yet on September 1 he received notice from the Government that his pay had been increased. Perhaps we can do something about situations like that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That each of the existing rates of basic compensation provided by title VI of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby increased by 17 percent of that part which is not in excess of \$5,000 per annum, such increase being applicable also on an annual basis to positions included in subsection 603 (c) (2) and 603 (d). Such

augmented rates provided in this act shall be considered to be the regular rates of basic compensation provided in section 603, and of positions the incumbents of which are being compensated at rates in another pay and classification system from which they have been transferred.

SEC. 2. The increase in existing rates of basic compensation provided in this act shall not be construed to be an equivalent increase in compensation within the meaning of section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

This act shall become effective upon the first day of the first pay period which begins after enactment.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That (a) section 603 (b) and section 603 (c) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates						
GS-1.....	\$2,600	\$2,680	\$2,760	\$2,840	\$2,920	\$3,000	\$3,080
GS-2.....	2,850	2,930	3,010	3,090	3,170	3,250	3,330
GS-3.....	3,050	3,130	3,210	3,290	3,370	3,450	3,530
GS-4.....	3,275	3,355	3,435	3,515	3,595	3,675	3,755
GS-5.....	3,500	3,625	3,750	3,875	4,000	4,125	4,250
GS-6.....	3,850	3,975	4,100	4,225	4,350	4,475	4,600
GS-7.....	4,225	4,350	4,475	4,600	4,725	4,850	4,975
GS-8.....	4,600	4,725	4,850	4,975	5,100	5,225	5,350
GS-9.....	5,000	5,125	5,250	5,375	5,500	5,625	5,750
GS-10.....	5,400	5,525	5,650	5,775	5,900	6,025	6,150
GS-11.....	5,800	6,000	6,200	6,400	6,600	6,800	
GS-12.....	6,800	7,000	7,200	7,400	7,600	7,800	
GS-13.....	8,000	8,200	8,400	8,600	8,800	9,000	
GS-14.....	9,200	9,400	9,600	9,800	10,000	10,200	
GS-15.....	10,400	10,650	10,900	11,150	11,400		
GS-16.....	11,600	11,800	12,000	12,200	12,400		
GS-17.....	12,600	12,800	13,000	13,200	13,400		
GS-18.....	14,400						

"(c) (1) The compensation schedule for the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates						
CPC-1.....	\$1,910	\$1,970	\$2,030	\$2,090	\$2,150	\$2,210	\$2,270
CPC-2.....	2,520	2,590	2,660	2,730	2,800	2,870	2,940
CPC-3.....	2,652	2,732	2,812	2,892	2,972	3,052	3,132
CPC-4.....	2,850	2,930	3,010	3,090	3,170	3,250	3,330
CPC-5.....	3,074	3,154	3,234	3,314	3,394	3,474	3,554
CPC-6.....	3,300	3,330	3,460	3,540	3,620	3,700	3,780
CPC-7.....	3,525	3,625	3,725	3,825	3,925	4,025	4,125
CPC-8.....	3,800	3,925	4,050	4,175	4,300	4,425	4,550
CPC-9.....	4,175	4,300	4,425	4,550	4,675	4,800	4,925
CPC-10.....	4,550	4,675	4,800	4,925	5,050	5,175	5,300

"(2) Charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of \$2,800 per annum, and head charwomen working part time at the rate of \$2,940 per annum."

"(b) In adjusting initially the rates of pay of employees affected by the provisions of this section—

"(1) an employee receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this act at one of the scheduled or longevity rates provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this act at the corresponding schedule or longevity rate as increased by this act; and

"(2) an employee receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this act at a rate other than a scheduled or longevity rate provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this act as follows:

"(A) If his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this act was less than the maximum longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at the scheduled or longevity rate which he would receive under paragraph (1) had he been receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date at the scheduled or longevity rate next higher than his rate of basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date.

"(B) If his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this act was in excess of the maximum longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately prior to such date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this act in such maximum longevity rate.

"(C) If he is a part-time char employee and his rate immediately prior to the ef-

fective date of this act was in excess of the rate provided for his position under section 603 (c) (2) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately prior to such effective date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this act in the rate for like positions under such section.

"(c) The limitations of \$9,600 and \$13,050 with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges, contained in the sixteenth paragraph under the head 'Miscellaneous salaries' in the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 759, 81st Cong.), or in any subsequent appropriation act, shall be increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this act.

"(d) Section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting '(a)' after 'Sec. 701.' and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Any increase in compensation granted by law after June 30, 1951, shall not be construed to be an equivalent increase in compensation within the meaning of subsection (a)."

"(e) No appropriations or funds available to any department or independent establishment (including Government-owned or controlled corporations) in the executive branch of the Government for personal services during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, shall be apportioned, on account of the increase in rates of compensation provided by this section and section 3 (a), in a manner which would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental appropriation for such fiscal year. This subsection

shall not apply to the field service of the Post Office Department or to any department or independent establishment, or any part thereof, which the President determines to be engaged in activities essential to the national defense.

"SEC. 2. (a) Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of \$400 per annum: *Provided*, That employees paid on an hourly or part-time basis shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 20 cents per hour.

"(b) Section 603 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, section 7 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, as amended, section 303 (c) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and the second paragraph under the heading "Increased Pay for Legislative Employees" in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, shall not apply to any officer or employee subject to subsection (a), but no such officer or employee shall, by reason of any provision of such acts or of this section, be paid with respect to any pay period basic compensation, or basic compensation plus additional compensation, at a rate in excess of \$11,246 per annum.

"(c) The rate of basic compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives (not including the presiding officers of the two Houses), the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, the legislative counsel of the Senate, the legislative counsel of the House of Representatives, and the Coordinator of Information of the House of Representatives is hereby increased by \$400 per annum.

"SEC. 3. The rates of annual basic compensation specifically provided by law for the following officers and employees in or under the executive branch of the Government are hereby increased by \$400:

"(1) physicians, dentists, nurses, and other employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration whose rates of basic compensation are provided by Public Law 293, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved January 3, 1946, as amended;

"(2) officers and employees whose rates of basic compensation are provided by sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

"SEC. 4. (a) This act shall become effective as of the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951.

"(b) No retroactive compensation or salary shall be payable by reason of the enactment of this act in the case of any individual not in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid a retired officer or employee for services rendered during the period beginning with the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951, and ending with the date of his retirement."

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee (interrupting the reading of the committee amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the committee amendment be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD and that it be open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out the controversial paragraph (e).

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RHODES to the committee amendment: Page 5, line 19, strike out paragraph (e), starting line 19, page 5, and ending line 8, page 6.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, unless this amendment is adopted the passage of this bill will be but an empty gesture. It will not give the Federal employees the salary increase that was intended by the sponsors of this legislation. It will not give these employees the same treatment that we just voted for the postal employees.

Paragraph (e) which my amendment will eliminate would unfairly affect a majority of Federal employees. I am inclined to agree with my friend, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] in what he said about the provision. My friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], who introduced this amendment in the committee, knows full well that no such proposal as this would ever be considered in our State of Pennsylvania where his party is a majority. Just last November we went through a campaign where his party said, "No more new taxes. We have got to stop this tax and tax and spend and spend." This very day in the Pennsylvania State Legislature they are considering the biggest tax program in the history of our State. They have the biggest spending program and the biggest bureaucracy on record. You never hear of a Jensen amendment or this kind of proposal where his party has complete control. It is unfair, impractical, and unsound. I think the provision should be stricken in order that classified employees can have the increases that we gave to other Federal employees, an increase to which they are justly entitled.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this amendment has been pretty well discussed during general debate, and I hope that there will be a limitation placed on the debate and that we bring it to a vote hurriedly.

However, in reply to the gentleman's remarks and about other persons saying that this particular section makes the bill an empty gesture, I want to remind them that this empty gesture is going to cost the taxpayers \$417,000,000. Now look. Just to get this thing clear and understandable, I will repeat. This legislation makes mandatory a \$400 across-the-board increase for every classified worker, every judicial employee and every executive employee. The section says, however, that as regards the executive departments, which are not exempted by reason of them being defense agencies as designated by the President, that they shall accomplish these increases within existing budgets. It means briefly that the employees will get \$400 per year increases, those who are retained. It is our belief and our very sincere belief that because of resignations and deaths and transfers this particular job can be done by an agency head who is worthy of his hire. I believe that the head of any private business,

given so much for salary purposes, can learn to live within that budget and I do not see any reason why our agency heads cannot learn to live within the budget, particularly when it is liberal.

I want to point out that as we have talked so often about more savings in government, here is an opportunity for the Congress to answer the mandate of the people and order the executive branch to put its house in order.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Is this statement correct, that this legislation affects approximately 200,000 employees and only those that are not in defense agencies?

Mr. CORBETT. The gentleman, as usual, is correct. It is between 200,000 and 220,000 employees.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Will the gentleman say whether he understands the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Federal Bureau of Customs, the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, and the Federal Bureau of Internal Revenue to be in the category of defense agencies?

Mr. CORBETT. Well, I do not know whether the Executive would determine exactly whether they are or not. I certainly think the fund-raising agencies and the FBI, given the job of ferreting out subversive activities, would be defense agencies, at least according to my interpretation of this provision.

Mr. CANFIELD. I emphasize the Bureau of Narcotics because the House recently voted an increase for it.

Mr. CORBETT. I certainly would agree with the gentleman that activity of that kind is certainly in the national defense.

I think there has been a great deal of misunderstanding about this section. I believe that perhaps its intent is misunderstood. I want to emphasize in closing that when a bill is going to pour \$417,000,000 of additional funds into the pockets of the Federal employees it is certainly not an empty gesture or hocus-pocus.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the lateness of the hour and the adequate time we have had to discuss this measure, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 3 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, the following letter opposing the provisions of this paragraph was written by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission to the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY]:

SEPTEMBER 20, 1951.

HON. TOM MURRAY, Chairman,
Post Office and Civil Service Com-
mittee, House of Representatives.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MURRAY: May I take this opportunity to invite your attention to the provisions of section 2 (e) of H. R. 339, a

bill to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes. The section of the bill I am referring to is quoted as follows:

"No appropriations or funds available to any department or independent establishment (including Government-owned or controlled corporations) in the executive branch of the Government for personal services during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, shall be apportioned, on account of the increase in rates of compensation provided by this section and section 3 (a), in a manner which would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental appropriation for such fiscal year. This subsection shall not apply to the field service of the Post Office Department or to any department or independent establishment, or any part thereof, which the President determines to be engaged in activities essential to the national defense."

The requirement that the Civil Service Commission absorb the cost of pay increases for its employees would add materially to the problems we already have in attempting to process our workloads and carry out the operating programs for which we are responsible. In short, it would mean the loss of additional employees over and above those we are required to lose under other restrictions. Let me cite to you a few specific figures:

1. Section 605 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for 1952 (the Jensen amendment) prohibits us from filling vacancies until such time as our July 1, 1951 employment strength has been reduced by 10 per cent. Since we had approximately 4,580 employees on our rolls July 1, 1951, a 10 per cent reduction in personnel by non-filling of vacancies will mean a loss of 458 employees.

2. Under the terms of the House bill to grant salary increases to Federal employees at a flat \$400 amount, the cost to the Civil Service Commission will be approximately \$1,800,000 per year.

In terms of the Senate bill, providing for a straight 10-percent increase with a limitation of \$800, it would cost the Commission approximately \$1,700,000.

3. The cost of the increases provided for in either of these two bills would considerably more than offset the savings we would realize through the operation of the Jensen amendment. In other words it would mean that we would lose additional employees over and above the 458 required by the Jensen amendment. In addition, as a further offsetting factor, we are advised that the President has approved a supplemental request for the Civil Service Commission amounting to \$1,700,000, which is required because of the alarming backlog of work in connection with loyalty determinations. To the extent this supplemental request is approved by the Congress, such additional hirings, resulting from the use of these funds, will result in further losses in total personnel in order to meet the increased salaries provided for by the pending legislation.

4. For the current fiscal year the Budget Bureau approved \$23,000,000 for the Commission. This amount was reduced by the Congress to \$17,500,000, a reduction of \$5,500,000. It is not possible for the Commission to keep current with its work because of this reduction, and it is for that reason we have asked for a supplemental appropriation. If the Commission is required to absorb the cost of salary increases it will offset the benefit we hope to get from the supplemental appropriation. I am sure the Congress does not want the Commission to be so situated that it cannot keep reasonably current with the investigation of loyalty.

For the reasons stated, I firmly believe that the Commission should not be required to absorb the cost of salary increases resulting from this legislation. To do so will les-

sen our ability to operate effectively, particularly in those areas where backlogs of work have accumulated and will continue to mount so long as we are not able to retain or hire the required personnel.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT RAMSPECK,
Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RABAUT) there were—ayes 78, noes 98.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RHODES and Mr. REES of Kansas.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported they were—ayes 117, noes 117.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GATHINGS). The Chair votes in the affirmative, and the amendment is agreed to.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUTTON: Page 6, line 9, strike out "Sec. 2 (a)", line 9 through line 15, and insert:

"SEC. 2. (a) Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of not less than \$400 per annum or 10 percent whichever is higher: *Provided*, That no increase for any individual shall exceed \$800 per annum; *Provided further*, That employees paid on an hourly or part-time basis shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 20 cents per hour."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I discussed when the rule was under consideration. It is an amendment that is different from any other section of this bill in that it carries a minimum of \$400 instead of providing a \$400 across-the-board raise, and it also adds a percentage of 10 percent. The reason for the 10 percent in this amendment is this: When the other body passed the bill, just yesterday, they provided a 10-percent increase for all employees with the exception of the Capitol Hill employees and those working in the legislative establishment, our clerks here at the table, our assistant doorkeeper, your own secretaries, the policemen about the building and out on the grounds, and all the employees of Capitol Hill; they inadvertently omitted the raise of 8.8-percent increase in the legislative branch to 10 percent.

A former distinguished Member of this body, Senator MONRONEY, who offered the amendment, said it was by inadvertence. I therefore consulted with him and worked out this amendment so that when this bill goes to conference there will be a discussion of the 10-percent increase; otherwise, if we do not adopt this 10-percent provision, automatically, they will consider the 8.8-percent increase and our Capitol Hill

employees will get only 8.8, and the 10-percent increase cannot even be mentioned in the conference.

The reason I offer a \$400 minimum is this: Personally I think that the workers on Capitol Hill are entitled to \$400 minimum and not over \$800 maximum, because they do not have rights under civil service, as I stated in my remarks under the rule. If you fire your secretary tonight—and you can do it—she has no right of appeal. She has no sick leave; she has no annual leave. It is through our graciousness that we give her a vacation; otherwise she has no discretion in the matter, neither does she have any accrued leave to collect, as she would have were she under civil service. For that reason I think they are entitled to some consideration that we give to the employees downtown.

Another thing, they do not work regular hours; secretaries report early in the morning and often work until 8, 9, 10, 11, and even 12 o'clock at night; they come down on Saturdays, and many work on Sundays; they are most loyal. They are going to vote, work, and campaign for you whether you vote for this amendment or not. But I am not thinking of votes now, I am thinking only that justice should be done to this group of loyal people. Your secretary can make you or break you, for when you are here on the floor or attending conferences or away from your office, it is your office employees who are responsible for your office efficiency, the employees on Capitol Hill are the ones who look after our welfare. When you are over here on the floor they are continuously on the job, they are ever diligent.

This amendment is so fair that I appeal to my friend and neighbor from the Volunteer State to accept the amendment.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I cannot accept the gentleman's amendment. As I have told the gentleman all along we will work it out in conference.

Mr. SUTTON. But how can you work it out in conference when there is no mention of 10 percent in the bill? There is nothing in the Senate bill but 8.8 percent, and you cannot even speak of 10 percent if it does not appear in one of the bills.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. RHODES. I think the gentleman's amendment is meritorious. I will give the gentleman's amendment my support.

Mr. SUTTON. I appreciate the gentleman's assistance and I hope our amendment will be adopted.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to my friend from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Does not the gentleman think that the employees of the legislative branch will be better off with the 8.8 percent than with the 10 percent? The 10 percent applies to their basic salary.

Mr. SUTTON. That is the reason that I put in a minimum of \$400 and make it 10 percent; because, if it is

only 8.8 percent some will get \$150, whereas under my amendment they would get \$400.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. Under the present bill does the legislative employee get \$400?

Mr. SUTTON. If we do not adopt my amendment, then under the Senate bill they would get 8.8 percent.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. This bill gives every employee from the lowest bracket to the highest \$400. Why then do you want to make a discrimination?

Mr. SUTTON. If you will insist on that in conference, that is different, but how are we going to know that you will? Let us adopt this amendment, then we will have something to go to conference on.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WICKERSHAM to the committee amendment: Page 8, line 10, after the period insert a new section as follows:

"() *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provisions of this act or other acts to the contrary, the provisions of this act shall apply to all State and county committees, employees, and field agents of the various State and county United States Department of Agriculture Production and Marketing Administration offices."

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely allows the raise to go to all AAA or PMA officials of the Department of Agriculture in the various States and county committees. It is only fair. They have been trying to get this for a number of years.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would explain his amendment further.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. In effect they are already Federal employees, however, they are not paid as other Federal employees are.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Are they paid by Federal funds alone?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. They are actually paid by Federal funds which are disbursed through State PMA offices. It is an indirect method of paying Federal funds. In my amendment I state "notwithstanding any other provisions" they are to be considered under this act.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. Will this amendment of the gentleman provide for a \$400 payment to PMA board members?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. This applies to the committee amendment. It applies to county and State committeemen and State officers who are paid out of PMA funds.

Mr. SUTTON. Your county committeemen do not make \$400 a year now.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That is all right, they should.

Mr. SUTTON. They will not average over \$100 a year.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The State offices and county committees are having difficulty in securing administrative officers, clerks, bookkeepers, field agents, stenographers, and other employees.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not a fact this money comes out of money that otherwise would go to pay the farmers for soil-conservation practices and if you pay the committeemen \$400 additional there will not be a thing left to pay for soil-conservation practices?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No, that is not true.

Mr. POAGE. It is true.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It is not true. The gentlemen from Arkansas and Texas fail to understand my amendment. This will be in addition to the funds which presently come from the State offices.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. Chairman, this House is certainly in the mood to raise salaries and wages if we adopt this amendment which would raise in the amount of \$400 per year the salaries and wages of every person in anywise connected with the Production and Marketing Administration, even though he may now be receiving only traveling expenses—and maybe a token payment—for his services.

I have voted for postal and classified employee wage and salary adjustments in an effort to afford these people just entitlements. I have always found that you receive in employment just about what you pay for—no more and no less. I have never felt that any employer gains anything by underpaying his employees. But, now, this idea of throwing away \$400 per year to everybody who is connected in anywise—shape, form, or fashion—with the Production and Marketing Administration where he is now only receiving actual expenses is something that I just cannot string along with. I cannot support this giveaway provision for many reasons.

First, this Government cannot afford such activities. Second, the \$400 that would be paid to committeemen of the Production and Marketing Administration would be deducted from the overall conservation program. This money could be used more advantageously to carry out soil-conservation practices. Third, even the recipients would object to the adoption of this amendment, because those committeemen are high-class citizens anxious to promote the conservation practices and would not think of depriving the program of this money. Those committeemen of the Production and Marketing Administration are con-

ducting the required grass-roots administration of this program, which has made it successful. They meet at the courthouse or some other place within the county once or twice a month for the purpose of administering the PMA program on behalf of themselves and their neighbors. They do not consider themselves Government employees and are not the type of people who would even suggest that this money be taken from the soil-conservation practices and given to them in the form of salaries.

I have asked the author of this amendment, the gentleman from Oklahoma, whether his proposed \$400 raise would also include the committeemen of the PMA program who are now receiving only expenses—and maybe a token payment, I don't know. He has told this House in answer to my question that the committeemen would and should be included. His amendment states that the act before us shall apply to all State and county committeemen, employees and field agents of the State and county United States Department of Agriculture Production and Marketing Administration offices.

Now, I favor the act applying to all employees and field agents of the State and county Production and Marketing Administration offices; but may I reemphasize that even the committeemen themselves would protest this \$400 per year contribution which would be paid out of soil-conservation funds. Those committeemen are farmers—the backbone of the Nation—and are interested in conservative governmental operations.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. May I ask the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], who does know something about the agricultural program, do the PMA employees within the counties on a permanent basis come within the increase provided in this bill even though they may not be civil-service employees. Since the PMA personnel are Federal employees, it would seem to me that the gentleman from Oklahoma does have a point that should be considered concerning these permanent Federal employees.

Mr. POAGE. These committeemen—

Mr. HARRIS. I am not talking about committeemen.

Mr. POAGE. That is what the gentleman from Oklahoma is talking about, and that is what the amendment relates to. These men who are paid at the present time for coming to the courthouse once or twice a month and get over the year \$50 to \$60 in expenses now, he would give each one of them an additional \$400 a year, and that money comes not out of the appropriations for that purpose but comes out of the money that you appropriate to carry on soil-conservation practices, and the more you pay out in salaries the less you have got to carry on the practices, and there will not be a

penny left in a great many of the counties of the United States if you pay this \$400.

Mr. HARRIS. Some of these people have talked to me about it. They are Federal employees. I agree with the gentleman insofar as committeemen are concerned, but you have got full-time Federal employees at the head of offices in each county, as well as clerks. They are semi-civil-service employees. They are paid by the Federal Government. Are they included in your \$400 raise?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, are they considered employees of the Department of Agriculture and do they get their pay by Federal checks? If so, they are included.

Mr. TACKETT. This salary readjustment act should apply to all employees of the Production and Marketing Administration—including employees and field agents of the various State and county offices—but not to the committeemen. The committee chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee, has just advised this House, in response to a question by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], that such State and county employees of the Production and Marketing Administration come within the increase provided in this pay-readjustment bill. However, I am hopeful that the gentleman from Oklahoma will revise his proposed amendment so as to make the bill under consideration applicable to all State and county employees and field agents of the Production and Marketing Administration offices, because I cannot believe that he would even request us to support the amendment in its present form.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that board members be excluded from my amendment and it be applied to the others.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. MASON. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee) there were—ayes, 195, noes 12.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GATHINGS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 339) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 421, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill

(S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) sections 603, (b) and 603 (c) of the Classification Act of 1949, approved October 28, 1949, as amended, are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the general schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates						
GS-1.....	\$2,420	\$2,500	\$2,580	\$2,660	\$2,740	\$2,820	\$2,900
GS-2.....	2,695	2,775	2,855	2,935	3,015	3,095	3,175
GS-3.....	2,915	2,995	3,075	3,155	3,235	3,315	3,395
GS-4.....	3,160	3,240	3,320	3,400	3,480	3,560	3,640
GS-5.....	3,410	3,535	3,660	3,785	3,910	4,035	4,160
GS-6.....	3,795	3,920	4,045	4,170	4,295	4,420	4,545
GS-7.....	4,205	4,330	4,455	4,580	4,705	4,830	4,955
GS-8.....	4,620	4,745	4,870	4,995	5,120	5,245	5,370
GS-9.....	5,060	5,185	5,310	5,435	5,560	5,685	5,810
GS-10.....	5,500	5,625	5,750	5,875	6,000	6,125	6,250
GS-11.....	5,940	6,140	6,340	6,540	6,740	6,940	
GS-12.....	7,040	7,240	7,440	7,640	7,840	8,040	
GS-13.....	8,360	8,560	8,760	8,960	9,160	9,360	
GS-14.....	9,600	9,800	10,000	10,200	10,400	10,600	
GS-15.....	10,800	11,050	11,300	11,550	11,800		
GS-16.....	12,000	12,200	12,400	12,600	12,800		
GS-17.....	13,000	13,200	13,400	13,600	13,800		
GS-18.....	14,800						

"(c) (1) The compensation schedule for the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates						
CPC-1.....	\$1,660	\$1,720	\$1,780	\$1,840	\$1,900	\$1,960	\$2,020
CPC-2.....	2,330	2,400	2,470	2,540	2,610	2,680	2,750
CPC-3.....	2,475	2,555	2,635	2,715	2,795	2,875	2,955
CPC-4.....	2,695	2,775	2,855	2,935	3,015	3,095	3,175
CPC-5.....	2,940	3,020	3,100	3,180	3,260	3,340	3,420
CPC-6.....	3,190	3,270	3,350	3,430	3,510	3,590	3,670
CPC-7.....	3,435	3,535	3,635	3,735	3,835	3,935	4,035
CPC-8.....	3,740	3,865	3,990	4,115	4,240	4,365	4,490
CPC-9.....	4,150	4,275	4,400	4,525	4,650	4,775	4,900
CPC-10.....	4,565	4,690	4,815	4,940	5,065	5,190	5,315

"(2) Charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of \$2,610 per annum, and head charwomen working part time at the rate of \$2,750 per annum."

(b) In adjusting initially the rates of pay of employees affected by the provisions of this section—

(1) an employee receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this act at one of the scheduled or longevity rates provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this act at the corresponding scheduled or longevity rate as increased by this act; and

(2) an employee receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this act at a rate other than a scheduled or longevity rate provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this act as follows:

(A) If his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this act was less than the maximum longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at the scheduled or longevity rate which he would receive under paragraph (1) had he been receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date at the scheduled or longevity rate next higher than his rate of basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date.

(B) If his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this act was in excess of the maximum longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately prior to such date, increased by an amount equal to

the amount of the increase made by this act in such maximum longevity rate.

(C) If he is a part-time char employee and his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this act was in excess of the rate provided for his position under section 603 (c) (2) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately prior to such effective date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this act in the rate for like positions under such section.

(c) (1) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed pursuant to section 62 (2) of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C. 102 (a) (2)), section 3656 of title 18 of the United States Code, the second and third sentences of section 603, section 604 (5), or sections 671 to 675, inclusive, of title 28 of the United States Code, or who are appointed pursuant to section 792 (b) of title 28 of the United States Code, are hereby increased by amounts equal to the increases provided by subsections (a) and (b) in corresponding rates of compensation paid to officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949.

(d) The limitations of \$9,600 and \$13,050 with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges, contained in the sixteenth paragraph under the head "Miscellaneous salaries" in the Judiciary Appropriation Act 1951 (Public Law 759, Eighty-first Congress), or in any subsequent appropria-

tion act, shall be increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this act.

(e) The increase in existing rates of basic compensation provided by this act shall not be construed to be an equivalent increase in compensation within the meaning of section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

Sec. 2. (a) Each officer or employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government (other than an employee in the office of a Senator) whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of (1) (8.8 percent of the aggregate rate of his basic compensation and the rate of the additional compensation received by him under sections 501 and 502 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, section 301 of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and the provisions under the heading "Increased pay for legislative employees" in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, or (2) \$800 per annum, whichever is the lesser.

(b) The provisions of section 603 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, section 7 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, as amended, section 303 (c) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and the provisions of paragraph (b) under the heading "Increased pay for legislative employees" in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, shall not apply to officers or employees subject to the provisions of subsection (a) or to employees in the offices of Senators, but no officer or employee of the Senate or House of Representatives shall be paid with respect to any pay period basic compensation or basic compensation plus additional compensation at a rate in excess of \$11,646 per annum unless expressly authorized by law.

(c) (1) The aggregate amount of the basic compensation authorized to be paid for administrative and clerical assistance and messenger service in the offices of Senators is hereby increased by—

(A) \$3,540 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is less than 3,000,000;

(B) \$3,720 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is 3,000,000 or more but less than 5,000,000;

(C) \$4,260 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is 5,000,000 or more but less than 10,000,000; and

(D) \$4,440 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is ten million or more.

(2) The second proviso in the paragraph relating to the authority of Senators to rearrange the basic salaries of employees in their respective offices, which appears in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, as amended (2 U. S. C. 60f), is amended by striking out "\$5,280" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$5,820"; and by striking out "\$6,720" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$7,320."

(d) The Legislative Branch Appropriation Act is amended by striking out, in the paragraph designated "Folding documents" under the heading "Contingent expenses of the Senate" the words "\$1 per thousand" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2 per thousand." The provisions of subsection (a), and the provisions of law referred to in such subsection, shall not apply to employees whose compensation is paid from the appropriation contained in such paragraph.

(e) The rate of basic compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives (not including the presiding officers of the two Houses), and of the legislative counsel of the Senate and the legislative counsel of the House of Representatives, are hereby increased by 8.8 percent or \$300 per annum, whichever is the lesser.

Sec. 3. (a) The annual compensation (including basic salary and additional compensation in lieu of overtime pay and night pay differential) of each officer and member of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, as increased by the act entitled "An act to provide for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to conform with the increased cost of living in the District of Columbia," approved July 14, 1945, as amended, and by the act entitled "An act to increase the compensation of certain employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1949, shall be further increased by 10 percent or \$800, whichever is the lesser. The proviso contained in the first sentence of the first section of said act of June 30, 1949, is hereby repealed; but no officer or member covered by this section shall, by reason of the enactment of this section, be paid with respect to any pay period, basic salary, or basic salary plus additional compensation at a rate in excess of \$11,130 per annum.

(b) (1) Each employee of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia whose salary is fixed and regulated by the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, except the Superintendent of Schools, shall receive, in addition to the compensation already provided by such act and by the act of June 30, 1949, compensation at the rate of 10 percent of the aggregate compensation provided by said acts, or \$800 per annum, whichever is the lesser.

(2) The basic and maximum salaries for all salary classes in title I of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, except class 29, are hereby increased by 10 percent or \$800, whichever is the lesser.

(c) Section 66 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 269) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 66. No director, officer, or employee of the Central Bank for Cooperatives, or of any production credit corporation, production credit association, or bank for cooperatives shall be paid compensation at a rate in excess of \$13,800 per annum."

(d) (1) Hereafter Foreign Service officers, including the class of career minister, and Foreign Service staff officers and employees, shall be compensated in accordance with the compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended and supplemented.

(2) Sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and all other provisions of such act which are inconsistent with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, are hereby repealed.

(3) Section 202 (2) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby repealed.

(4) The compensation of any Foreign Service officer or Foreign Service staff officer or employee who is an officer or employee of the United States on the effective date of this amendment shall not be reduced by reason of the provisions of this amendment; but when any such position becomes vacant any new appointee shall be compensated in accordance with the compensation schedules of, and regulations issued by the Civil Service Commission under, the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(e) The rate of basic compensation for physicians, dentists, nurses, and other employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration whose rates of basic compensation are provided by Public Law 293, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved January 3, 1946, as amended, are hereby increased 10 percent or \$800 per annum, whichever is the lesser.

Sec. 4. This act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1951.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 622 and insert the pro-

visions of the bill H. R. 339 as passed, as follows: "That (a) section 603 (b) and section 603 (c) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the general schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates						
GS-1	\$2,600	\$2,680	\$2,760	\$2,840	\$2,920	\$3,000	\$3,080
GS-2	2,850	2,930	3,010	3,090	3,170	3,250	3,330
GS-3	3,050	3,130	3,210	3,290	3,370	3,450	3,530
GS-4	3,275	3,355	3,435	3,515	3,595	3,675	3,755
GS-5	3,500	3,625	3,750	3,875	4,000	4,125	4,250
GS-6	3,850	3,975	4,100	4,225	4,350	4,475	4,600
GS-7	4,225	4,350	4,475	4,600	4,725	4,850	4,975
GS-8	4,600	4,725	4,850	4,975	5,100	5,225	5,350
GS-9	5,000	5,125	5,250	5,375	5,500	5,625	5,750
GS-10	5,400	5,525	5,650	5,775	5,900	6,025	6,150
GS-11	5,800	6,000	6,200	6,400	6,600	6,800	7,000
GS-12	6,800	7,000	7,200	7,400	7,600	7,800	8,000
GS-13	8,000	8,200	8,400	8,600	8,800	9,000	9,200
GS-14	9,200	9,400	9,600	9,800	10,000	10,200	10,400
GS-15	10,400	10,600	10,800	11,000	11,200	11,400	11,600
GS-16	11,600	11,800	12,000	12,200	12,400	12,600	12,800
GS-17	12,800	13,000	13,200	13,400	13,600	13,800	14,000
GS-18	14,000						

"(c) (1) The compensation schedule for the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates						
CPC-1	\$1,910	\$1,970	\$2,030	\$2,090	\$2,150	\$2,210	\$2,270
CPC-2	2,520	2,590	2,660	2,730	2,800	2,870	2,940
CPC-3	2,652	2,732	2,812	2,892	2,972	3,052	3,132
CPC-4	2,850	2,930	3,010	3,090	3,170	3,250	3,330
CPC-5	3,074	3,154	3,234	3,314	3,394	3,474	3,554
CPC-6	3,300	3,380	3,460	3,540	3,620	3,700	3,780
CPC-7	3,525	3,625	3,725	3,825	3,925	4,025	4,125
CPC-8	3,800	3,925	4,050	4,175	4,300	4,425	4,550
CPC-9	4,175	4,300	4,425	4,550	4,675	4,800	4,925
CPC-10	4,550	4,675	4,800	4,925	5,050	5,175	5,300

"(2) Charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of \$2,800 per annum, and head charwomen working part time at the rate of \$2,940 per annum.

"(b) In adjusting initially the rates of pay of employees affected by the provisions of this section—

"(1) an employee receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this act at one of the scheduled or longevity rates provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this act at the corresponding scheduled or longevity rate as increased by this act; and

"(2) an employee receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this act at a rate other than a scheduled or longevity rate provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this act as follows:

"(A) If his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this act was less than the maximum longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at the scheduled or longevity rate which he would receive under paragraph (1) had he been receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date at the scheduled or longevity rate next higher than his rate of basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date.

"(B) If his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this act was in excess of the maximum longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately prior to such date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this act in such maximum longevity rate.

"(C) If he is a part-time char employee and his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this act was in excess of the rate provided for his position under section 603 (c) (2) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately prior to such effective date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this act in the rate for like positions under such section.

"(c) The limitations of \$9,600 and \$13,050 with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges, contained in the sixteenth paragraph under the head 'Miscellaneous salaries' in the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 759, 81st Cong.), or in any subsequent appropriation act shall be increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this act.

"(d) Section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting '(a)' after 'Sec. 701.' and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Any increase in compensation granted by law after June 30, 1951, shall not be construed to be an equivalent increase in compensation within the meaning of subsection (a)."

"Sec. 2. (a) Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of not less than \$400 per annum or 10 percent whichever is higher: *Provided*, That no increase for any individual shall exceed \$800 per annum: *Provided further*, That employees paid on an hourly or part-time basis shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 20 cents per hour.

"(b) Section 603 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, section 7 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, as amended, section 303 (c) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and the second paragraph under the heading 'Increased pay for legislative employees' in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, shall not apply to any officer or employee subject to subsection (a), but no such officer or employee shall, by reason of any provision of such acts or of this section, be paid with respect to any pay period basic compensation, or basic compensation plus additional compensation, at a rate in excess of \$11,246 per annum.

"(c) The rate of basic compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives (not including the Presiding Officers of the two Houses), the Parliamentarian of the House of the Representatives, the legislative counsel of the Senate, the legislative counsel of the House of Representatives, and the Coordinator of Information of the House of Representatives is hereby increased by \$400 per annum.

"SEC. 3. The rates of annual basic compensation specifically provided by law for the following officers and employees in or under the executive branch of the Government are hereby increased by \$400:

"(1) physicians, dentists, nurses, and other employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration whose rates of basic compensation are provided by Public Law 293, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved January 3, 1946, as amended;

"(2) officers and employees whose rates of basic compensation are provided by sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

"SEC. 4. (a) This act shall become effective as of the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951.

"(b) No retroactive compensation or salary shall be payable by reason of the enactment of this act in the case of any individual not in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act; except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid a retired officer or employee for services rendered during the period beginning with the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951, and ending with the date of his retirement."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings whereby the bill H. R. 339 was passed were vacated, and the bill was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 5411) to amend Public Laws 815 and 874 of the Eighty-first Congress with respect to schools in critical defense areas and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, in the list of the conferees for the legislative branch appropriations bill which appears on page 11715 of the RECORD for September 17, 1951, there is a typographical error. Mr. TAYLOR's name appears as one of the conferees instead of Mr. TABER's. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected to show Mr. TABER's name.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ORDERLY COTTON MARKETING PROGRAM

(Mr. SMITH of Mississippi asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include a list.)

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, 100 representatives from throughout the Cotton Belt have today joined me in urging cotton farmers to participate in the orderly marketing program by placing at least half of their 1951 crop into the Commodity Credit Corporation loan until a fair market price develops.

I am introducing the statement which we have signed, together with the names of those who have joined in signing it, as a part of my remarks.

The holding movement can be a weapon in the hands of the farmer to convert a buyer's market into a seller's market. Demand factors now apparent in the cotton supply picture make it clear that the current price for cotton is not at a fair level for the producer. If the farmer will act to exercise greater control of the market himself, there is hope of getting this fair price while cotton still remains in the farmers' hands.

This holding movement represents a great opportunity for the cotton farmer to change the historic pattern of market factors which combine to depress the price during the marketing season. It is an opportunity which should not be passed up.

The farmer cannot hope to get the best price for his cotton unless he takes concerted action throughout the Cotton Belt.

The statement follows:

The cotton farmers of America, in response to a call from their Government in the name of national defense, have produced a record crop for 1951, now being harvested. Unless coordinated action is taken by the cotton farmer and the Government, however, the reward for this patriotic demonstration of American productive power is likely to be financial penalties to be borne by the producer.

At a time when the costs of cotton production are the highest in history, the price has declined 10 cents per pound. Urgent steps are needed to develop a stable market, and to offer hope for a better price.

Those of us who represent the cotton-farming areas have initiated steps by the Government designed to improve the demand for cotton, but these various actions will have no full cumulative effect until well beyond the normal marketing season. The one weapon in the hand of the farmer is the withholding of his cotton from the market until a fair price is reached.

Cotton can be withheld from the market in an orderly fashion, without undue risk for the farmer, by placing it in the loan program with the Commodity Credit Corporation. All major farm organizations representing cotton producers have urged that farmers take advantage of this program.

As representatives in Congress of the cotton farmer, we want to urge all cotton producers to join this program for orderly marketing. If every cotton farmer will place half of his crop in the loan as it is picked and ginned, or otherwise withhold it from the market, there is real hope that the price can be improved. The operation of the market during the first months of the harvest season indicates the withholding program has been of considerable benefit. If the movement spreads, the farmer will have made the most effective use possible of the price support structure which the Government has provided.

FRANK SMITH; HAROLD D. COOLEY; T. G. ABERNETHY; W. R. POAGE; FRANK IKARD; LINDLEY BECKWORTH; E. L. FORRESTER; JAMES P. RICHARDS; W. F. NORRELL; E. C. GATHINGS; ROBERT L. SIKES; TOM STEED; OMAR BURLESON; CARROLL REECE; WOODROW W. JONES; TOM PICKETT; CARL T. DURHAM; ROBERT E. JONES, JR.; CLIFFORD DAVIS; JOE L. EVINS; CARL ELLIOTT; KENNETH A. ROBERTS; JOSEPH R. BRYSON; E. E. COX; JOHN H. KERR; HERBERT C. BONNER; JAMIE L. WHITTEN; JOHN E. LYLE, JR.; W. M. (DON) WHEELER; JERE COOPER; ANTONIO FERNANDEZ; CLARK W. THOMPSON; TOM MURRAY; ALBERT RAINS; HAROLD A. PATTEN; OLIN TEAGUE; HOMER THORNBERRY; PAUL JONES; VICTOR WICKERSHAM; HENRY D. LARCADE; PORTER HARDY, JR.; ARTHUR WINSTEAD; BROOKS HAYS; E. E. WILLIS; F. EDWARD HEBERT; A. SIDNEY CAMP; PAUL BROWN; PRINCE H. PRESTON; JAMES W. TRIMBLE; TOBY MORRIS; JOHN BELL WILLIAMS; F. E. CARLYLE; ED. DEGRAFFENRIED; PAT SUTTON; OVERTON BROOKS; JOHN PHILLIPS; GEO. ANDREWS; GEO. GRANT; HENDERSON LANHAM; OTTO E. PASSMAN; O. C. FISHER; GEORGE MAHON; ERNEST BRAMBLETT; GRAHAM BARDEN; ALLAN O. HUNTER; MENDELL RIVERS; ALBERT GORE; MONROE M. REDDEN; ROBERT L. DOUGHTON; WILBUR D. MILLS; JOHN J. DEMPSEY; BOYD TACKETT; OREN HARRIS; W. J. BRYAN DORN; CHARLES B. DEANE; WILLIAM STIGLER; CARL VINSON; A. S. HERLONG, JR.; J. PERCY PRIEST; CARL ALBERT; HAMILTON C. JONES; JOHN R. MURDOCK; LAURIE C. BATTLE; JOHN L. McMILLAN; J. FRANK WILSON; KEN REGAN; NOBLE J. GREGORY; JAMES C. DAVIS; THOMAS H. WERDEL; GEO. B. SCHWABE; WRIGHT PATMAN; JOHN J. RILEY; HALE BOGGS; THURMOND CHATHAM; WM. M. COLMER; JIMMY MORRISON; C. W. BISHOP; WINGATE LUCAS; JOHN S. WOOD; WALTER ROGERS.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

(Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to find out from the majority leader the program for Monday and the remainder of next week, if he has that information available at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be very glad to give the gentleman the information I have now, although I can only announce the program for Monday as yet. There are no rules reported out. The Committee on Rules is meeting tomorrow. I am hopeful they will report out

actment of this act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid a retired postmaster, officer, or employee for services rendered during the period beginning July 1, 1951, and ending with the date of his retirement.

And to amend the title so as to read: "A bill to reduce the number of grades for positions in the postal field service and to provide salary increases for personnel in such service."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of

South Carolina, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. CARLSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) section 603 (b) and section 603 (c) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the general schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates						
GS-1.....	\$2,600	\$2,680	\$2,760	\$2,840	\$2,920	\$3,000	\$3,080
GS-2.....	2,850	2,930	3,010	3,090	3,170	3,250	3,330
GS-3.....	3,050	3,130	3,210	3,290	3,370	3,450	3,530
GS-4.....	3,275	3,355	3,435	3,515	3,595	3,675	3,755
GS-5.....	3,500	3,625	3,750	3,875	4,000	4,125	4,250
GS-6.....	3,850	3,975	4,100	4,225	4,350	4,475	4,600
GS-7.....	4,225	4,350	4,475	4,600	4,725	4,850	4,975
GS-8.....	4,600	4,725	4,850	4,975	5,100	5,225	5,350
GS-9.....	5,000	5,125	5,250	5,375	5,500	5,625	5,750
GS-10.....	5,400	5,525	5,650	5,775	5,900	6,025	6,150
GS-11.....	5,800	6,000	6,200	6,400	6,600	6,800	
GS-12.....	6,800	7,000	7,200	7,400	7,600	7,800	
GS-13.....	8,000	8,200	8,400	8,600	8,800	9,000	
GS-14.....	9,200	9,400	9,600	9,800	10,000	10,200	
GS-15.....	10,400	10,650	10,900	11,150	11,400		
GS-16.....	11,600	11,800	12,000	12,200	12,400		
GS-17.....	12,600	12,800	13,000	13,200	13,400		
GS-18.....	14,400						

"(c) (1) The compensation schedule for the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates						
CPC-1.....	\$1,910	\$1,970	\$2,030	\$2,090	\$2,150	\$2,210	\$2,270
CPC-2.....	2,520	2,590	2,660	2,730	2,800	2,870	2,940
CPC-3.....	2,652	2,732	2,812	2,892	2,972	3,052	3,132
CPC-4.....	2,850	2,930	3,010	3,090	3,170	3,250	3,330
CPC-5.....	3,074	3,154	3,234	3,314	3,394	3,474	3,554
CPC-6.....	3,300	3,380	3,460	3,540	3,620	3,700	3,780
CPC-7.....	3,525	3,625	3,725	3,825	3,925	4,025	4,125
CPC-8.....	3,800	3,925	4,050	4,175	4,300	4,425	4,550
CPC-9.....	4,175	4,300	4,425	4,550	4,675	4,800	4,925
CPC-10.....	4,550	4,675	4,800	4,925	5,050	5,175	5,300

"(2) Charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of \$2,800 per annum, and head charwomen working part time at the rate of \$2,940 per annum."

(b) In adjusting initially the rates of pay of employees affected by the provisions of this section—

(1) an employee receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this act at one of the scheduled or longevity rates provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this act at the corresponding scheduled or longevity rate as increased by this act; and

(2) an employee receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this act at a rate other than a scheduled or longevity rate provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this act as follows:

(A) If his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this act was less than the maximum longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at the scheduled or longevity rate which he would receive under paragraph (1) had he been receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date at the scheduled or longevity rate next higher than his rate of basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date.

(B) If his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this act was in excess of the maximum longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately prior to such date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this act in such maximum longevity rate.

(C) If he is a part-time char employee and his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this act was in excess of the rate provided for his position under section 603 (c) (2) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately prior to such effective date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this act in the rate for like positions under such section.

(c) The limitations of \$9,600 and \$13,050 with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges, contained in the sixteenth paragraph under the head "Miscellaneous salaries" in the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 759, 81st Cong.), or in any subsequent appropriation act shall be increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this act.

(d) Section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting

"(a)" after "Sec. 701" and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Any increase in compensation granted by law after June 30, 1951, shall not be construed to be an equivalent increase in compensation within the meaning of subsection (a)."

SEC. 2. (a) Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of not less than \$400 per annum or 10 percent whichever is higher; *Provided*, That no increase for any individual shall exceed \$800 per annum; *Provided further*, That employees paid on an hourly or part-time basis shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 20 cents per hour.

(b) Section 603 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, section 7 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, as amended, section 303 (c) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and the second paragraph under the heading "Increased pay for legislative employees" in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, shall not apply to any officer or employee subject to subsection (a), but no such officer or employee shall, by reason of any provision of such acts or of this section, be paid with respect to any pay period basic compensation, or basic compensation plus additional compensation, at a rate in excess of \$11,246 per annum.

(c) The rate of basic compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives (not including the presiding officers of the two Houses), the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, the legislative counsel of the Senate, the legislative counsel of the House of Representatives, and the Coordinator of Information of the House of Representatives is hereby increased by \$400 per annum.

SEC. 3. The rates of annual basic compensation specifically provided by law for the following officers and employees in or under the executive branch of the Government are hereby increased by \$400.

(1) physicians, dentists, nurses, and other employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration whose rates of basic compensation are provided by Public Law 293, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved January 3, 1946, as amended;

(2) officers and employees whose rates of basic compensation are provided by sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

SEC. 4. (a) This act shall become effective as of the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951.

(b) No retroactive compensation or salary shall be payable by reason of the enactment of this act in the case of any individual not in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid a retired officer or employee for services rendered during the period beginning with the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951, and ending with the date of his retirement.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. JOHNSTON

of South Carolina, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. BUTLER of Maryland conferees on the part of the Senate.

REVENUE ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4473) to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I speak to the pending business before the Senate, House bill 4473, and I offer to it amendment designated as "9-20-51-D." First I wish to ask that the current RECORD show and that any subsequent printing show that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] also joins the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and me in sponsoring the amendment. It is through an oversight that the name of the Senator from New Hampshire was not included. The same is true of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

The amendment is to strike from the bill section 313 which deals with mutual savings banks and building and loan associations. It proposes on page 142, beginning with line 11, to strike out all of section 313 down to and including line 6 on page 145; and on page 145, beginning with line 7, to strike out the numerals "314" and insert the numerals "313," and renumber all following sections accordingly.

Mr. President, the point I wish to make in connection with this amendment to strike out is that this section will result in an active exhibition of the power to destroy which for many years has been recognized—I think the first recognition went back to John Marshall—as being inherent in the power to tax.

I shall address myself particularly to the mutual savings banks. Other Senators who support the amendment will address themselves particularly to the building and loan associations, in which also I have as deep a personal interest as I have in the savings banks; since I was a charter member of the building and loan association of my home town of Springfield, Vt., which must have been organized 30 or 40 years ago, and have been a member of it ever since, having taken out shares from time to time as the old shares have matured. But, as I said, I shall address myself first to the problems of the mutual savings banks.

Since those are more commonly found in the northeastern section of the country than in other sections, I shall take a few moments to describe them. The building and loan associations and mutual savings banks are pretty well scattered over the country, and I think most of the Senators on the floor are aware of the way in which they operate, and the part they fill in our national economy. But I feel that in view of the action taken by the Finance Committee there must have been some misconceptions with regard to the mutual savings banks, which were not fully explained away during the sessions of the committee, which were, as can be imagined,

long, hard sessions of two and sometimes three meetings a day, and it was difficult at times, perhaps, for the committee to appreciate the facts.

There are 529 mutual-savings banks in the United States, most of them concentrated on the North Atlantic seaboard. At the end of 1950 total deposits in them aggregated about \$20,000,000,000, belonging to approximately 19,250,000 depositors, of whom approximately 2,000,000 were school children. The average account is about \$1,000. The average school child's account is about \$23. They are very old institutions.

The first mutual savings banks were formed back in 1816. From the beginning their purpose has not been to make money, for they have no stockholders. There is no one to whom profits can inure except to the depositors. They have been managed by public supported trustees who can have no financial interest in any transaction of the bank. They are, to put it briefly and plainly, purely fiduciary institutions. They accept deposits under terms prescribed by the laws of the State in which they operate. They apply the best business judgment available, under the terms of the laws under which they operate, to the investments of these sums, and the depositor gets the result of the wise and skillful administration, or the administration of whatever character it may turn out to be, in the form of interest on the deposits. There is no other return to anyone, outside of the expenses involved.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I understand the Senator has said that the mutual-savings bank is a purely fiduciary operation, and that no one gets any benefit from it other than the depositor.

Mr. FLANDERS. Other than those who receive money in the form of expenses, salaries, purchases, the janitor, the cashier, and the clerks—no one else.

Mr. KERR. I should like to ask the Senator what the savings banks do with the profits.

Mr. FLANDERS. The savings banks make profits on the money entrusted to them. They pay expenses from those profits. They make contributions to the reserves which are set up by State laws from those profits.

Mr. KERR. Is that a contribution or an allocation?

Mr. FLANDERS. I do not know just what the difference in the mind of the Senator is between those two words. It is not a contribution in the sense of a contribution to an outside worthy cause. I wish the Senator would explain a little more clearly what he has in mind.

Mr. KERR. I was not trying to argue with the Senator. I thought I understood that he was describing the operation of the savings bank whereby it took a certain amount of money, percentage-wise or otherwise, from its profits, and placed it into the account in the bank which is identified as a reserve account, and I take it that that is an allocation or deposit of that account, and

not a contribution in the ordinary understanding of the word "contribution."

Mr. FLANDERS. Let me say to the Senator from Oklahoma at once that I may have misused terms in an accounting sense. There is no profit until expenses have been paid.

Mr. KERR. What does the mutual savings bank do with the money it makes out of its operations?

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator says, "the money it takes." Does he mean clear profits?

Mr. KERR. The Senator can place any interpretation upon the language he wishes to give it.

Mr. FLANDERS. I cannot answer the Senator's question without knowing what his question is.

Mr. KERR. As I understand the situation, a mutual savings bank takes the money deposited with it and loans it out; and on the money that it loans out, or on the money it invests, it receives certain returns in the form of profits.

Mr. FLANDERS. Those are not yet profits to the savings bank, until the savings bank has paid its expenses.

Mr. KERR. Aside from the technical interpretation or application of the terms "profits" and "expenses," would the Senator mind answering the question as to what the savings bank does with the money it receives on the money which it invests, as it comes into the bank, in whatever form it comes, first, in the payment of the expenses of the bank; second, in allocating whatever are the necessary or recognized reserves to the reserve account; third, to the payment of the depositors of the interest which is due them on their deposits, and fourth, if there is yet money remaining out of its income, will the Senator tell the Senate what the bank does with it?

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma that I know of no other uses of the funds received from investment, aside from those of paying expenses, of setting up reserves, and of paying an interest rate to the depositors.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. If I may finish—

Mr. LEHMAN. I simply wished to explain something to the Senator.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator aware of the fact that over and above those amounts, the savings banks of the country, with deposits in excess of \$20,000,000,000, are earning in excess of \$100,000,000 a year?

Mr. FLANDERS. I do know that they have a little more than 11 percent of their earnings in reserves.

Mr. KERR. Is not the way to state it that they have a reserve built up from earnings, which at this time approximates 11 percent of their total deposits?

Mr. FLANDERS. They do have such reserves built up. As to whether or not they are excessive, I should like to read from the testimony given by Mr. Howe—

Mr. KERR. Would the Senator care to answer the question of the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. FLANDERS. I wish to read something which indicates that in Mr. Howe's



House of Representatives

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God, our Father, in whom alone we can find help for each new day and hope for every unknown tomorrow, we rejoice that Thou art always willing to guide the erring, to heal the afflicted, to comfort the sorrowing, to strengthen the weak, and to forgive the sinful.

We pray that in these tragic and troublous days we may be more conscious of the moral and spiritual laws which Thou hast ordained, obedience to which will emancipate us from all fear and foreboding and fill our minds with peace.

We penitently confess that we are continually trying to exploit Thee and to use Thee for our own selfish ends instead of seeking to be used by Thee in the fulfillment of Thy wise and holy plans and purposes.

Grant that we may embody the spirit of our blessed Lord, that spirit of trust, of compassion, of kindness, and of love which never sought its own but the glory of God and the welfare of all mankind.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

READJUSTMENT OF POSTAL RATES

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1046) to readjust postal rates, with House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MURRAY of Tennessee, RHODES, BURNSIDE, REES of Kansas, and CORBETT.

ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF FIELD SERVICE OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 355) to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, with House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following

conferees: Messrs. MURRAY of Tennessee, MORRISON, DAVIS of Georgia, REES of Kansas, and HAGEN.

COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, with House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MURRAY of Tennessee, DAVIS of Georgia, WHITAKER, REES of Kansas, and Mrs. ST. GEORGE.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 434, Rept. No. 1029), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2006) to increase the lending authority of Export-Import Bank of Washington and to extend the period within which the bank may make loans. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the rule just filed may be considered sometime today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, as I understand it this rule inadvertently was not filed yesterday. By agreeing to the unanimous-consent request we make it possible to proceed with the consideration of this measure today.

Mr. SABATH. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

OLE BJORN KRAFT, MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF DENMARK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker at any time during the day to declare a recess for the purpose of the Members of the House receiving and meeting a distinguished visitor to our country, His Excellency Ole Bjorn Kraft, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Government of Denmark.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE LATE JOHN JOSEPH McGRATH

(Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I announce to the House the death of my predecessor in office, the Honorable John Joseph McGrath, a Democratic Member of the House from the Eighth District of California from 1933 to 1939. During his entire term he served in this House as a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. McGrath was born in Limerick, Ireland, on July 23, 1872. He died on August 24, 1951, at Mills Hospital, San Mateo, Calif. He was educated in the national schools and Christian Brothers College, Cork, Ireland. He came to the United States as a child and lived practically his entire adult life in San Mateo County.

He was employed for a number of years as a wholesale sales manager. He served as postmaster at San Mateo from 1916 to 1925. He was president of the San Mateo-Burlingame-Hillsborough Chamber of Commerce for four terms. From 1939 until his retirement he was commissioner of immigration and naturalization at San Francisco.

Mr. McGrath is survived by his widow, the former Mary Agnes Kelley; his son, Dr. John J. McGrath, of Napa, Calif.; and his two daughters, Mrs. Richard Ojeda, of Glendale, Calif., and Mrs. William Partlow, of Fresno, Calif.

I know that my colleagues who served with Mr. McGrath while he was in office join me in extending our deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD in connection with the life and services of Mr. McGrath.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of the Representatives in the House who served with Judge McGrath in the Seventy-third, Seventy-fourth, and Seventy-fifth Congresses remember him with real affection, because he was a truly lovable man. When I first came to Congress in 1937, Judge McGrath occupied an office across the hall from the one which was assigned to me in the Old House Office Building. As a new Member I was deeply appreciative of his friendliness and the many helpful suggestions which he made to me during my novitiate in the House.

Before I came to Congress I had known him and had numerous official contacts with him in the civic and governmental affairs of the peninsula of San Francisco. After his retirement from Congress in 1939 it was a great pleasure to me to be able to endorse him for appointment as commissioner of immigration and naturalization at San Francisco. He served with distinction in that office until it went out of existence in 1940.

When Judge McGrath first came to Congress he brought with him as his secretary, Capt. Victor Hunt Harding, who is now well known to all of us as Deputy Sergeant of Arms of the House.

The passing of Judge McGrath has removed from the life of northern California a bright and free spirit whose memory will have an affectionate place in the hearts of all those who knew him. His service to the State and Nation was always honorable and constructive, and those of us who were privileged to be his friends have had the measure of our happiness in life increased by the experience of having known him.

To his widow, Mrs. Mary Agnes Kelley McGrath; his son, Dr. John J. McGrath, of Napa, Calif.; his daughters, Mrs. Richard Ojeda, of Glendale; and Mrs. William Partlow, of Fresno; and to his three grandchildren, I extend my sincere sympathy.

(Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

DE GASPERI'S VISIT POINTS UP NEED TO HELP ITALY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, we were all impressed yesterday with the appearance of the Premier of Italy, Alcide de Gasperi. I do, indeed, hope that he will not go back to Italy empty-handed. If he does so, because of the impending elections there he will have mincemeat made of himself by the Communists.

He told us that 10 percent of the active or adult population of Italy were out of employment. You know and I know that more jobs are needed, that idle hands make empty bellies, and empty bellies make for communism.

Italy has been deprived of her empire, the Dodecanese Islands, Trieste, and other lands to which Italians might emigrate. Italy cannot support and control 46,000,000 souls. She is bursting at her seams with reference to surplus population. Ways and means must be found whereby she can have opportunities for her people to emigrate to various lands.

I hope that our State Department will take the initiative to help Italy in that regard.

Further, the peace treaty with Italy must be modified. We cannot make fish of one and fowl of another. We have offered soft terms to Japan. We must do the same thing to Italy, particularly since Italy is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Onerous provisions in those treaties must indeed be modified to make her a successful and cooperative member of that North Atlantic Treaty team.

PASCAL NEMOTO YUTAKA

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 617) for the relief of Pascal Nemoto Yutaka.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me it is about time we put a stop to flooding the country with foreigners in this way. I do not know about this individual case, but I will ask the gentleman from Ohio to explain it.

Mr. FEIGHAN. This particular bill is a private bill introduced by Senator KNOWLAND admitting to this country a 3-year-old infant, half Japanese and half American, who was adopted by a lieutenant and his wife in Japan.

Mr. RANKIN. Our immigration laws should not be set aside in this way. By this going beyond the quota limit and bringing in these people, this country is being literally flooded with un-American elements, a vast number of whom are today undermining and trying to wreck this Government and to destroy the American way of life.

Mr. FEIGHAN. He was adopted. He is a 3-year-old infant, half American and half Japanese.

Mr. RANKIN. They always have some kind of an excuse for going around the immigration law and bringing these people in here.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to object for the time being, until I have an opportunity to look into the case.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 435) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That FRANK IKARD, of Texas, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMBAT PAY FOR INFANTRY OFFICERS

(Mr. BENNETT of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we have just passed legislation raising the pay of Federal employees, including postal employees. I voted for that legislation, because I thought it was good

legislation. For quite a time now, we have had before us a very much more overdue piece of legislation which deals with combat pay for infantry soldiers. We have long had this legislation before Congress, and yet no action has been taken upon it. I, Mr. POTTER, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. VINSON, and perhaps other Members of Congress, have introduced legislation along that line. I think that recognition of the tremendous sacrifices of the ground troops is long overdue. Members of the Armed Forces who are assigned to other duty which is considered hazardous receive extra pay ranging from \$30 to \$210 per month. Yet, statistics show that ground troops are engaged in the most hazardous duty of all. In World War II, the Infantry, which made up only one-fourth of the Army, including the air corps, suffered 70 percent of all Army casualties. As of September 19, 1951, a total of 83,257 casualties had been suffered by United States Armed Forces in the Korean war, of which 81,517 were in the Army and Marine Corps.

As to recognition in the form of awards and decorations, army combat divisions awarded 2.5 decorations per man killed in World War II while the Marine Corps awarded 2.7. The ratio of awards to men killed was higher in the rest of the services, ranging up to 40.9 awards per man killed.

With the approach of another bitter Korean winter, we are keenly conscious of the many hardships to which combat ground troops are subjected. Day after day, these men must fight in all kinds of weather conditions. They are customarily deprived of baths, warm meals, sleep in beds and the normal comforts of life.

This is not to detract in any way from the fine work done by the other branches of the service. We all appreciate what they have done and are doing. The purpose is rather to accord ground troops the recognition they deserve without in any way detracting from the fine service rendered by the other branches of the service.

The bill which I have introduced provides in part, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) each enlisted man and officer of the Armed Forces below the grade of major who is assigned to a rifle battalion and entitled to receive basic pay shall, in addition to such basic pay, be entitled to receive special combat pay at the rate of \$50 for each calendar month during any part of which such battalion actually receives hostile small-arms ground fire while engaged with the enemy, provided that he is physically present at the time of such hostile small-arms ground fire and is within range thereof. Such special combat pay shall be included in the computation of any death gratuity or benefit payable as the result of the death of such enlisted man or officer while entitled thereto.

(b) No person shall be eligible to receive the special combat pay provided by this section if he is authorized to receive any incentive or special pay pursuant to section 203, 204, or 205 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949.

I sincerely hope that Congress will soon be allowed to pass upon the merits of this legislation, or some similar bill, to show consideration for America's

INCREASING RATES OF COMPENSATION OF OFFICERS
AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

OCTOBER 18, 1951.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany S. 622]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: *That (a) section 603 (b) and section 603 (c) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, are amended to read as follows:*

“(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

“Grade	Per annum rates							
GS-1.....	\$2,500	\$2,580	\$2,660	\$2,740	\$2,820	\$2,900	\$2,980	
GS-2.....	2,750	2,830	2,910	2,990	3,070	3,150	3,230	
GS-3.....	2,950	3,030	3,110	3,190	3,270	3,350	3,430	
GS-4.....	3,175	3,255	3,335	3,415	3,495	3,575	3,655	
GS-5.....	3,410	3,535	3,660	3,785	3,910	4,035	4,160	
GS-6.....	3,795	3,920	4,045	4,170	4,295	4,420	4,545	
GS-7.....	4,205	4,330	4,455	4,580	4,705	4,830	4,955	
GS-8.....	4,620	4,745	4,870	4,995	5,120	5,245	5,370	
GS-9.....	5,060	5,185	5,310	5,435	5,560	5,685	5,810	
GS-10.....	5,500	5,625	5,750	5,875	6,000	6,125	6,250	
GS-11.....	5,940	6,140	6,340	6,540	6,740	6,940		
GS-12.....	7,040	7,240	7,440	7,640	7,840	8,040		
GS-13.....	8,360	8,560	8,760	8,960	9,160	9,360		
GS-14.....	9,670	9,870	10,000	10,200	10,400	10,600		
GS-15.....	10,800	11,050	11,300	11,550	11,800			
GS-16.....	12,000	12,200	12,400	12,600	12,800			
GS-17.....	13,000	13,200	13,400	13,600	13,800			
GS-18.....	14,800							

2 INCREASE RATES OF COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

“(c) (1) *The compensation schedule for the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule shall be as follows:*

“Grade	Per annum rates						
CPC-1-----	\$1,810	\$1,870	\$1,930	\$1,990	\$2,050	\$2,110	\$2,170
CPC-2-----	2,420	2,490	2,560	2,630	2,700	2,770	2,840
CPC-3-----	2,552	2,632	2,712	2,792	2,872	2,952	3,032
CPC-4-----	2,750	2,830	2,910	2,990	3,070	3,150	3,230
CPC-5-----	2,974	3,054	3,134	3,214	3,294	3,374	3,454
CPC-6-----	3,200	3,280	3,360	3,440	3,520	3,600	3,680
CPC-7-----	3,435	3,535	3,635	3,735	3,835	3,935	4,035
CPC-8-----	3,740	3,865	3,990	4,115	4,240	4,365	4,490
CPC-9-----	4,150	4,275	4,400	4,525	4,650	4,775	4,900
CPC-10-----	4,565	4,690	4,815	4,940	5,065	5,190	5,315

“(2) *Charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of \$2,700 per annum, and head charwomen working part time at the rate of \$2,840 per annum.*”

(b) *In adjusting initially the rates of pay of employees affected by the provisions of this section—*

(1) *an employee receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this Act at one of the scheduled or longevity rates provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this Act at the corresponding scheduled or longevity rate as increased by this Act; and*

(2) *an employee receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this Act at a rate other than a scheduled or longevity rate provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this Act as follows:*

(A) *If his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this Act was less than the maximum longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at the scheduled or longevity rate which he would receive under paragraph (1) had he been receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date at the scheduled or longevity rate next higher than his rate of basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date.*

(B) *If his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this Act was in excess of the maximum longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately prior to such date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this Act in such maximum longevity rate.*

(C) *If he is a part-time char employee and his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this Act was in excess of the rate provided for his position under section 603 (c) (2) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately prior to such effective date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this Act in the rate for like positions under such section.*

(c) *The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed pursuant to section 62 (2) of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C. 102 (a) (2)), section 3656 of title 18 of the United States Code, the second and third sentences of section 603, section 604 (5), or sections 672 to 675, inclusive, of title 28 of the United States Code, or who are appointed pursuant to section 792 (b) of title 28 of the United States Code, are hereby*

increased by amounts equal to the increases provided by subsections (a) and (b) in corresponding rates of compensation paid to officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949.

(d) The limitations of \$9,600 and \$13,050 with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges, contained in the sixteenth paragraph under the head "Miscellaneous salaries" in the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 759, Eighty-first Congress), or in any subsequent appropriation Act, shall be increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this Act.

(e) Section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 701." and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Any increase in compensation granted by law after June 30, 1951, shall not be construed to be an equivalent increase in compensation within the meaning of subsection (a)."

SEC. 2. (a) Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government (other than an employee in the office of a Senator) whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 10 per centum of the aggregate rate of his basic compensation and the rate of the additional compensation received by him under sections 501 and 502 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, section 301 of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and the provisions under the heading "Increased pay for legislative employees" in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, except that (1) no such officer or employee shall be paid additional compensation at a rate less than \$300 per annum or in excess of \$800 per annum, and (2) employees paid on an hourly or part-time basis shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 20 cents per hour.

(b) The provisions of section 603 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, section 7 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, as amended, section 303 (c) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and the provisions of paragraph (b) under the heading "Increased pay for legislative employees" in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, shall not apply to officers or employees subject to the provisions of subsection (a) or to employees in the offices of Senators, but no such officer or employee, or any other officer or employee of the Senate or House of Representatives, shall be paid with respect to any pay period basic compensation or basic compensation plus additional compensation at a rate in excess of \$11,646 per annum unless expressly authorized by law.

(c) (1) The aggregate amount of the basic compensation authorized to be paid for administrative and clerical assistance and messenger service in the offices of Senators is hereby increased by—

(A) \$4,140 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is less than three million;

(B) \$4,860 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is three million or more but less than five million;

(C) \$5,220 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is five million or more but less than ten million; and

(D) \$5,760 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is ten million or more.

(2) The second proviso in the paragraph relating to the authority of Senators to rearrange the basic salaries of employees in their respective offices, which appears in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, as amended (2 U. S. C. 60f), is amended by striking out "\$5,280" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$5,880"; and by striking out "\$6,720" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$7,320".

(3) Notwithstanding the third proviso in such paragraph any increase in the compensation of an employee in a Senator's office shall take effect on the effective date of this Act or on the date such employee became employed, whichever is later, if (A) the certification filed by such Senator under such proviso so provides, (B) such certification is filed in the disbursing office of the Senate not later than November 30, 1951, and (C) the amount of such increase does not exceed the amount of the increase which would be payable in the case of such employee if he were subject to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

(d) The provisions of subsection (a), and the provisions of law referred to in such subsection, shall not apply to employees whose compensation is paid from the appropriation contained in the paragraph designated "Folding documents" under the heading "Contingent expenses of the Senate" in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act.

(e) The rates of basic compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives (not including the presiding officers of the two Houses), the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, the legislative counsel of the Senate, the legislative counsel of the House of Representatives, and the Coordinator of Information of the House of Representatives are hereby increased by 10 per centum, except that in no case shall any such rate be increased by less than \$300 per annum or by more than \$800 per annum.

SEC. 3. Section 66 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 269) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 66. No director, officer, or employee of the Central Bank for Cooperatives, or of any production credit corporation, production credit association, or bank for cooperatives shall be paid compensation at a rate in excess of \$13,800 per annum."

SEC. 4. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration whose rates of basic compensation are provided by Public Law 293, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved January 3, 1946, as amended, are hereby increased by 10 per centum, except that in no case shall any such rate be increased by less than \$300 per annum or by more than \$800 per annum.

(b) Section 8 (d) of Public Law 293, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out "\$12,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,800".

SEC. 5. (a) The rates of basic compensation provided by sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, are hereby increased by 10 per centum, except that in no case shall any such rate be increased by less than \$300 per annum, or by more than \$800 per annum.

(b) The Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission are authorized and directed to transmit to the Post Office and Civil Service Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives on or before April 1, 1952, a report on pay and personnel practices being followed in overseas areas by all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, including the Foreign Service of the State Department.

SEC. 6. (a) This Act shall become effective as of the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951.

(b) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid under this Act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid a retired officer or employee for services rendered during the period beginning with the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951, and ending with the date of his retirement.

And the House agree to the same.

TOM MURRAY,
JAMES C. DAVIS,
JOHN WHITAKER,
EDWARD H. REES,
KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
MIKE MONRONEY,
JOHN M. BUTLER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

Except for the differences noted in the following statement, the conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

Subsection (a) of the first section of the House amendment amends the compensation schedules in section 603 (b) and section 603 (c) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (including the annual full-time rates for part-time charwomen), by increasing each per annum rate in such schedules by \$400. Subsection (a) of the first section of the conference substitute amends such schedules by increasing the minimum rate of each grade by 10 percent and the resulting increase is applied uniformly to every other rate in the grade. However, no rate is increased less than \$300 or more than \$800. The annual full-time rate for part-time charwomen is increased by \$300.

Subsection (c) of the first section of the conference substitute provides that the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the judicial branch of the Government shall be increased by amounts equal to the increases provided by the conference substitute at corresponding rates of compensation paid to officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. This subsection was not contained in the House amendment, since the compensation of most of the officers and employees covered by the subsection may be fixed by administrative action. The subsection does not specifically cover United States court reporters, but the committee of conference feel strongly that the Judicial Conference should adjust the salaries of these court reporters to conform to the increases provided by the conference substitute. This subsection was contained in the Senate bill.

Section 2 (a) of the House amendment provides that each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation of \$400 per annum or 10 percent, whichever is higher, with the limitation that no increase for any individual shall exceed \$800 per annum. Additional compensation for hourly or part-time employees is fixed at the rate of 20 cents per hour. Section 2 (a) of the conference sub-

stitute provides that such legislative officers and employees (except employees in the offices of Senators) shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 10 percent of their gross compensation, except that no such officer or employee shall receive an increase in rate of compensation of less than \$300 per annum or more than \$800 per annum. Additional compensation for hourly or part-time employees remains at the rate fixed by the House amendment, namely 20 cents per hour.

Section 2 (b) of the House amendment places a ceiling of \$11,246 per annum on the aggregate rate of compensation payable to officers and employees in or under the legislative branch who are subject to section 2 (a). Section 2 (b) of the conference substitute provides for a ceiling of \$11,646 per annum on the aggregate rate of compensation of (1) such officers and employees, (2) employees in the offices of Senators, and (3) any other officers or employees of the Senate and House of Representatives, unless a higher rate of compensation is expressly authorized by law.

Section 2 (c) of the conference substitute is included in order that Senators may, if they wish, grant to employees in their own offices (who are excluded from the provisions of sec. 2 (a)) increases corresponding to those provided for other legislative employees under section 2 (a). Paragraph (1) of section 2 (c) increases the clerk-hire allotments of Senators by an amount sufficient to pay such increases; paragraph (2) of such section raises the existing ceilings on base pay of employees in Senators' offices by an amount sufficient to permit the making of such increases; and paragraph (3) of such section authorizes Senators to make such increases retroactive to July 1.

Section 2 (d) of the conference agreement provides that the increases in the rates of compensation granted by section 2 (a) shall not apply to certain piecework employees of the Senate engaged in the folding of documents. This provision is included because these employees received an increase in compensation under the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1952, identical in amount to the increase proposed to be granted such employees under the Senate bill.

Section 2 (c) of the House amendment increases by \$400 per annum the rates of basic compensation of the elected officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives (not including the presiding officers of the two Houses), the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, the Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives, and the Coordinator of Information of the House of Representatives. Section 2 (e) of the conference substitute adds to such list of officers the Parliamentarian of the Senate, and provides that the rates of basic compensation of all such officers shall be increased by 10 percent, except that in no case shall any such rate be increased by less than \$300 per annum or by more than \$800 per annum. It is the intent of the conferees, in adding the Parliamentarian of the Senate to the list of officers specified in section 2 (c), that the increase under such section shall be added to any increase provided for the Senate Parliamentarian in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952.

Section 3 of the conference substitute amends section 66 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 by increasing the maximum rate of compensation which may be paid to a director, officer, or employee of the Central Bank for Cooperatives, or of any production credit corpora-

tion, production credit association, or bank for cooperatives from \$13,000 per annum to \$13,800 per annum. There is no corresponding provision in the House amendment.

Section 3 of the House amendment increases by \$400 the rates of annual basic compensation of (1) physicians, dentists, nurses, and other employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration whose rates of compensation are provided by Public Law 293, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved January 3, 1946, as amended, and (2) officers and employees whose rates of basic compensation are provided by sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

Section 4 (a) of the conference substitute provides that the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration described in the preceding paragraph shall be increased by 10 percent, except that in no case shall any such rate be increased by less than \$300 per annum or by more than \$800 per annum.

Section 4 (b) of the conference substitute amends section 8 (d) of such Public Law 293 by increasing the maximum amount of pay, plus allowance, which any person rated as a medical or surgical specialist under section 8 of such Public Law 293 may receive, from \$12,000 to \$12,800.

Section 5 (a) of the conference substitute provides that rates of basic compensation prescribed by sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, shall be increased by 10 percent, except that in no case shall any such rate be increased by less than \$300 per annum or by more than \$800 per annum.

Section 5 (b) of the conference substitute authorizes and directs the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission to transmit to the Post Office and Civil Service Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives on or before April 1, 1952, a report with respect to pay and personnel practices followed in overseas areas by all departments and agencies of the Government, including the Foreign Service of the Department of State.

TOM MURRAY,
JAMES C. DAVIS,
JOHN WHITAKER,
EDWARD H. REES,
KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

sion, Petersburg, Va., to the Petersburg Battlefield Museum Corp.; and H. R. 5601, relating to the disposition of certain former recreational demonstration project lands by the Commonwealth of Virginia to the School Board of Mecklenburg County, Va.

Representative Patten spoke on behalf of the Gila Pueblo bill (H. R. 4765), which he introduced in the House; and Representative Abbitt, author of H. R. 5599 and H. R. 5601, spoke on behalf of his bills. Favorable reports on all measures were received from the Department of the Interior. Witnesses testifying on the various bills were Conrad L. Wirth, Assistant Director, National Park Service; Edward J. Kelly, Director of National Capital Park and Planning; and Ira B. Lykes, former superintendent of the Prince William Forest Park.

Committee also considered, but took no action on, H. R. 2327, to authorize the exchange of lands acquired for Prince William Forest Park, Prince William County, Va., for the purpose of consolidating Federal holdings therein.

WAR CLAIMS—TRADING WITH THE ENEMY

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Conducted hearings today on a series of bills which would amend the War Claims Act and the Trading With the Enemy Act. In the order listed committee heard witnesses on the following measures: H. R. 2263, to permit the Alien Property Custodian, after settlement of debt claims to distribute the remaining money of an ineligible corporation to eligible stockholders, holding less than all the stock, as their interests may appear; and H. R. 4284, to provide for reimbursement to an American owning either directly or beneficially a part, but less than all, of an enemy corporation taken over by the Alien Property Custodian. (Raoul Berger, an attorney of Washington, D. C., testified on these two bills.)

H. R. 5467, to permit the return under section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of property which an alien acquired by gift, devise, bequest, or inheritance, from an American citizen; and H. R. 2758, a similar bill, on which the author, Representative Buffett, testified.

H. R. 3719, 4345, and 4522, similar measures which provide for compensation at the rate of \$1.50 per day payable from the war claims fund, for unpaid compulsory labor in violation of the Geneva Convention of 1929, and for inhumane treatment of prisoners of war. (Representative Fernandez testified on this legislation and also submitted a statement for Representative Dempsey, author of H. R. 3719.)

H. R. 2656, 1620, 2559, and S. 302, similar bills which would eliminate the provision of the Trading With the Enemy Act limiting to \$5 million the aggregate value of property which the Alien Property Custodian may return to certain persons under an exception to the rule against returns to citizens or residents of enemy countries during the war years, namely, persons who have been U. S. citizens continuously since December 7, 1941, and

persons who lost U. S. citizenship through marriage and have regained it prior to September 29, 1950. (Representative Fogarty and Frank L. Hinckley of Providence, R. I., testified on this legislation.)

H. R. 4701, to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, to provide for paying the claims of survivors of prisoners of war put to death by the Government of Japan; and H. R. 2931, to amend the War Claims Act to allow payment not exceeding \$50,000 on account of the death of any member of the Armed Forces as the result of a violation of the obligation by any member of the German or Japanese military forces to cease hostilities. (Representative Bailey, author of H. R. 2931, spoke on behalf of his bill.)

Hearings will be continued tomorrow for further consideration of amendments to these acts.

IMMIGRATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Walter Subcommittee No. 1 approved for reporting to the full committee 39 private immigration bills (11 of the House and 28 of the Senate). One House immigration bill was reported adversely.

ORGANIZED BASEBALL

Committee on the Judiciary: Celler Subcommittee on the Study of Monopoly Power heard further testimony at its investigation as to whether organized baseball violates antitrust laws. Continuing with its schedule of club owners, ball players, umpires, and sports writers, the subcommittee heard the following witnesses at today's session: T. J. Halligan, Flint, Mich., president of the Central League (class A); William Werber, former major- and minor-league player; R. G. Lynch, Milwaukee Journal; Franklin W. Yeutter, Philadelphia Bulletin; and Walter (Red) Smith, of the New York Herald Tribune. Recessed until tomorrow morning, when various major-league stars are scheduled to testify.

REVENUE STUDY

Committee on Ways and Means: King Subcommittee on Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws resumed its hearings regarding irregularities in collectors' offices throughout the country. The first witness today was James Donovan, an attorney, of Lawrence, Mass., who testified regarding payment of fees to Denis Delaney, collector of internal revenue in Boston, Mass., for extending influence in certain tax cases. He was followed by Daniel Friedman, of the Estate Research Bureau, New York City, who refused to answer pertinent questions on the grounds of possible self-incrimination. During the afternoon session the committee heard testimony from the following internal-revenue agents from the upper New York division: Mordecai Miller, William Dettmer, Ralph DeMayo, and Jack Neustadt. Also heard from Charles Hagopian, of Bronx, N. Y., who discussed certain tax matters as an individual taxpayer. Recessed until tomorrow morning.

CONTROLLED-MATERIALS PLAN

Select Committee To Study Problems of Small Business: Burton Subcommittee No. 3 resumed hearings today for the purpose of cross-examining representatives of the Defense Production Administration and the National Production Authority regarding apparent inconsistencies in previous testimony as to the operations of the entire controlled-materials plan and its effect on small business. The subcommittee has held many hearings during this session regarding the CMP in defense agencies, and has considered many serious questions from small-business concerns dependent upon steel, aluminum, and copper for the conduct of their businesses. Officials of the DPA at today's session were Melvin L. Anshen, Assistant Deputy Administrator, Office of Program and Requirements; and George A. Steiner, Acting Deputy Administrator, Office of Program and Requirements. NPA officials to testify at today's meeting were W. C. Truppner, Assistant Administrator for Production Controls; Frank T. McCue, Deputy Director, Iron and Steel Division; Frank Creedon, Assistant Administrator, Bureau of Facilities and Construction; John Peckham, Director, Compliance Division; John R. D. Ranson, Deputy Director, Agricultural Machinery and Implement Division; and W. B. Quail, Director of the Iron and Steel Division. Adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

Joint Committee Meetings

TAX REVISION

Conferees on H. R. 4473, tax revision, met in executive session to reconsider its report which the House recommitted to it on October 16, and agreed to file a new report after making the following changes:

- (1) That increase in income tax rates in the first bracket be reduced from 11½ percent to 11 percent;
- (2) That maximum rate on long-term capital gains for individuals and corporations be increased from the present 25 percent to 26 percent;
- (3) That the effective date of the cut-back of the average earnings credit under the excess profits tax from 85 percent to 83 percent be changed from January 1, 1952, to July 1, 1951;
- (4) That, in the case of excise taxes, electric garbage-disposal units be added to the list of electrical appliances subject to the 10-percent manufacturers' tax, and that skates be deleted from list of sporting goods subject to the 15-percent manufacturers' excise tax;
- (5) That rural electrification cooperatives and certain mutual insurance companies exempt under section 101 (10) or (11) and mutual insurance companies taxable under Supplement G are to be exempted from the requirement of filing information returns with respect to patronage dividends or refunds made to their patrons;
- (6) That the present method for computing the holding period in the case of timber subject to the provisions

of section 117 (k) (2) be retained. (Under the present law the holding period runs only to the date of the contract for disposal of the timber, instead of the date of the cutting of the timber as under the bill.)

(7) That the provision giving capital-gain treatment to coal royalties be made inapplicable in computing the income subject to the surtax on improper accumulations under section 102 and the surtax on personal holding companies under section 500;

(8) That the provision in the bill giving capital-gain treatment to lump-sum payments received at retirement upon the release of rights to future profits of the employer be restricted to cases where the employee was entitled to such profits either for the duration of his life or for at least 5 years after retirement; and

(9) That the provision in the bill allowing 3-year carry-over of net operating losses for years 1948 and 1949 be liberalized to include 1947, in the case of new companies.

POSTAL RATES

Conferees, in executive session, agreed to file a report on the differences between the House- and Senate-passed versions of S. 1046, to readjust certain postal rates. As approved, the bill would increase postal rate on post cards to 2 cents; retain the present rate on first-class and air-mail letters; increase second-class mail 10 percent each of the next 3 years, totaling 30 percent increase; third-class mail would be increased from 1 to 1½ cents, effective July 1, 1952; provisions on fourth-class mail were stricken from the bill, leaving the present ICC rates in effect; special services would be increased in accordance with the House provisions, and the Postmaster General would be authorized to set rates in the future for special services; and the conferees agreed to follow the Hoover Commission recommendations.

In the case of title II of the bill, the conferees accepted the system of graduated annual leave for Government employees, with one change, increasing length of service in the first category from 2 to 3 years.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' PAY INCREASE

Conferees, in executive session, agreed to file a conference report on the differences between the House- and Senate-passed versions of H. R. 622, Government employees' pay increase.

As approved by the conferees, the bill would provide for a 10-percent pay increase for classified Government employees with a \$300 minimum for each and an \$800 maximum; the pay increase would be applicable to legislative employees, Foreign Service employees, and employees of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the VA.

They agreed to eliminate pay increase provisions for D. C. police and firemen, school teachers, and employees of the Board of Education, with the understanding that the D. C. Committee would approve such a bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

(Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there are no more worthy Federal employees than those in the postal service. The postal system of the United States is the communications system of American business and of the American economy. Without it we could not function as a nation. The postal employee is one worthy of his hire. The strange paradox of the Fair Deal administration is that it has slighted the legitimate functions of government such as our postal system and has mushroomed the questionable areas of government activity.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD..

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, the post-office and civil-service conference committee has reported out one bill for classified employees and another for postal employees.

I think this is regrettable. Certainly the House conference committee has failed to adhere to the views explicitly expressed by the House of Representatives. The House passed two bills covering classified and postal employees. Under the provisions of these bills their salaries would be increased \$400 a year.

It is only fair to treat all Federal employees alike as far as salaries are concerned. Salaries for all should be comparable. There should be no double standard for pay purposes.

I favor the bills passed by the House. I reiterate that it is most regrettable the conference committee did not comply with the views of the House.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the present inequities of compensation schedules as effecting our postal employees. This injustice should not be permitted to continue. We owe to these faithful Government employees not only fine words of appreciation for the splendid service they have rendered through the years, but monetary recognition that will enable them to meet the present high cost of living.

The increases they were given in the past do not begin to enable them to meet the inflationary conditions that now exist. Although insufficient compensation and other unsatisfactory working conditions have been sorely felt, yet they have continued working with no diminution of their endeavor to give satisfactory service to the public. The time has come when we are in duty bound to give the relief they are entitled to have. Recent increases in postal rates should enable this action to be taken without creating any deficit in the Post Office Department.

I shall support the conference report that increases their compensation and

trust the other Members of the House will do likewise.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON] inquired with respect to the additional cost of this bill. I have been informed just now by the Post Office Department that the figure is approximately \$255,000,000.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, since the conference report represents substantially the legislation already approved by the House, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 339, nays 7, not voting 82, as follows:

[Roll No. 211]

YEAS—339

Abbutt	Cole, Kans.	Harrison, Va.
Abernethy	Colmer	Harrison, Wyo.
Afair	Cooley	Hart
Addonizio	Cooper	Harvey
Albert	Corbett	Havener
Allen, Ill.	Cotton	Hays, Ohio
Andersen,	Coudert	Hébert
H. Carl	Cox	Hedrick
Andresen,	Crosser	Heffernan
August H.	Crumpacker	Heller
Anfuso	Cunningham	Herter
Arends	Curtis, Mo.	Heseltun
Aspinall	Curtis, Nebr.	Hill
Auchincloss	Davis, Ga.	Hillings
Ayres	Davis, Tenn.	Hinshaw
Bailey	Deane	Hoeven
Baker	DeGraffenried	Hoffman, Ill.
Bakewell	Denny	Hollifield
Barden	Denton	Holmes
Barrett	Devereux	Hope
Bates, Mass.	Dingell	Horan
Battle	Dollinger	Howell
Beall	Dolliver	Hull
Beamer	Donohue	Hunter
Beckworth	Donovan	Ikard
Belcher	Doughton	Jackson, Wash.
Bender	Doyle	James
Bennett, Fla.	Durham	Jarman
Bennett, Mich.	Eaton	Javits
Bentsen	Eberharter	Jenison
Berry	Elliott	Jenkins
Betts	Ellsworth	Jensen
Bishop	Elston	Jonas
Blatnik	Evins	Jones, Ala.
Boggs, Del.	Fallon	Jones, Mo.
Bolling	Feighan	Jones,
Bolton	Fenton	Hamilton C.
Bonner	Fernandez	Jones,
Bow	Fisher	Woodrow W.
Boykin	Flood	Karsten, Mo.
Bray	Fogarty	Kean
Brehm	Forand	Kearns
Brown, Ga.	Ford	Keating
Brownson	Forrester	Kee
Bryson	Frazier	Kelly, N. Y.
Buchanan	Fugate	Kerr
Buckley	Fulton	Kersten, Wis.
Budge	Furcolo	Kilday
Buffett	Gamble	King
Burdick	Garmatz	Kirwan
Burleson	Gary	Klein
Burnside	Gavin	Kluczynski
Burton	George	Lane
Bush	Goodwin	Lanham
Butler	Gordon	Lantaff
Byrne, N. Y.	Gore	Larcade
Byrnes, Wis.	Graham	LeCompte
Camp	Granahan	Lesinski
Canfield	Grant	Lind
Cannon	Green	Lovre
Carlyle	Greenwood	McCarthy
Carnahan	Gregory	McConnell
Case	Gross	McCormack
Celler	Gwinn	McCulloch
Chatham	Hale	McGregor
Chelf	Hall,	McGuire
Chenoweth	Leonard W.	McKinnon
Chipperfield	Halleck	McMillan
Chudoff	Hand	McMullen
Church	Harden	McVey
Clemente	Hardy	Machrowicz
Clevenger	Harris	Mack, Wash.

Madden
Magee
Mahon
Mansfield
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Meador
Merrow
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Mitchell
Morano
Morgan
Morris
Morton
Multer
Mumma
Murdock
Murray, Tenn.
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara
O'Konski
O'Neill
Ostertag
O'Toole
Patman
Patten
Patterson
Philbin
Pickett
Poage
Polk
Potter
Preston
Price
Priest

Rabaut
Radwan
Rains
Ramsay
Rankin
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Rhodes
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers
Roberts
Robeson
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Sadlak
St. George
Sasscer
Saylor
Schwabe
Scott, Hardie
Scott,
Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Scudder
Secrest
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Sheehan
Sheppard
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Sittler
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Stanley

Steed
Stigler
Stockman
Sutton
Tackett
Talle
Taylor
Teague
Thomas
Thompson,
Mich.
Thompson, Tex.
Tollefson
Trimble
Vail
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Walter
Weichel
Welch
Wharton
Wheeler
Whitaker
Wickersham
Widnall
Wier
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Withrow
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood, Idaho
Woodruff
Yates
Yorty

NAYS—7

Andrews
Gathings
Hoffman, Mich.

Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Taber

Whitten

NOT VOTING—82

Aandahl	Golden	Murray, Wis.
Allen, Calif.	Granger	Passman
Allen, La.	Hagen	Perkins
Anderson, Calif.	Hall	Phillips
Angell	Edwin Arthur	Poulson
Armstrong	Hays, Ark.	Powell
Baring	Herlong	Prouty
Bates, Ky.	Hess	Quinn
Blackney	Irving	Reams
Boggs, La.	Jackson, Calif.	Redden
Bosone	Johnson	Regan
Bramblett	Judd	Ribicoff
Brooks	Kearney	Richards
Brown, Ohio	Kelley, Pa.	Rogers, Fla.
Busbey	Kennedy	Roosevelt
Cole, N. Y.	Keogh	Sabath
Combs	Kilburn	Shelley
Crawford	Latham	Short
Dague	Lucas	Sieminski
Davis, Wis.	Lyle	Sikes
Dawson	McDonough	Thornberry
Delaney	McGrath	Vinson
Dempsey	Mack, Ill.	Watts
D'Ewart	Martin, Iowa	Werdel
Dondero	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Tex.
Dorn	Morrison	Wood, Ga.
Engle	Moulder	Zablocki
Fine	Murphy	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Rogers of Florida with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Short.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Allen of California.
Mr. Engle with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Fine with Mr. Hagen.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Quinn with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Armstrong.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Johnson.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Latham.

Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Angell.
 Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Aandahl.
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Dague.
 Mr. Keogh with Mr. Crawford.
 Mr. Murphy with Mr. Cole of New York.
 Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Busbey.
 Mr. Passman with Mr. Kearney.
 Mr. Perkins with Mr. D'Ewart.
 Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Bramblett.
 Mr. Sieminski with Mr. McDonough.
 Mr. Baring with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Shelley with Mr. Jackson of California.
 Mr. McGrath with Mr. Phillips.
 Mr. Sikes with Mr. Poulson.
 Mr. Regan with Mr. Prouty.
 Mr. Redden with Mr. Golden.
 Mr. Granger with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
 Mr. Dorn with Mr. Reams.

Mr. WHEELER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' PAY INCREASE

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 18, 1951.)

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

(Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this is a conference report involving increases in salaries for the classified employees of the Government and employees of the legislative and judicial branches. There are about 1,100,000 employees covered by this legislation.

The House passed a bill which gave a \$400 flat increase to all these employees from top to bottom. The Senate passed a bill which gave a percentage increase of 10 percent to all employees, with a maximum increase of \$800 and with no minimum increase or floor. So the major point in disagreement between the conferees of the House and Senate was whether or not the House version, a \$400 flat increase to all employees, be agreed to or the 10-percent increase with a maximum of \$800 as provided in the Senate bill be agreed to.

After much deliberation and discussion the conferees reached a compromise

agreement to the effect that a minimum increase of \$300 would be given to every employee; that any employee who made less than \$3,000 a year would get a \$300 increase, that employees making from \$3,000 to \$8,000 would get a 10-percent increase on the amount of their present salaries and that the increase on all salaries above \$8,000 would be \$800. So you have by this compromise proposal a minimum of \$300, a maximum of \$800, and a 10-percent increase to apply on all salaries between \$3,000 and \$8,000. This is a unanimous conference report.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will cost \$418,000,000. I may say that the two conference reports for all Federal employees, the one for the postal employees and the one for classified employees, will cost the Government approximately \$700,000,000. Of course, this is a staggering amount. As I have stated on this floor previously, I am disturbed at the gigantic cost of our Federal payroll, which today is about \$10,000,000,000. With these two bills totaling \$700,000,000, you will either have to provide for additional revenue by new taxes or else go on with more deficit financing.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, this again is an extremely important piece of legislation. It affects 1,100,000 employees of the Federal Government and increases the cost of Government, as our chairman has just told you, approximately \$418,000,000.

I think I should state briefly that the bill that passed the House provided for an increase of \$400 across the board for all of those employed in the Federal classified service. The other body provided for a 10-percent increase with a ceiling of \$800. The conference report, in substance, says that there shall be a 10-percent increase, except that there should be a floor of \$300. However, none shall receive less than \$300 annually or more than \$800 per annum.

I believe it is fair to state by way of further explanation and review that all of the bills submitted to the House committee dealing with additional compensation for classified employees provided for an increase in salaries of not less than 17 percent. The Civil Service Commission recommended an increase of between 7 and 8 percent.

The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, as in the case of the postal pay bills, provided for a flat increase of \$400 annually across the board to all classified employees, and for 20-percent increase to those employed on an hourly basis. In other words, all Federal employees would be treated substantially alike with respect to increases in compensation.

Here is a brief summary and explanation of the legislation now under consideration:

A 10-percent increase in compensation, with a \$300 per annum minimum and an \$800 maximum; is granted the following Federal employees:

First, employees under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended;

Second, officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government;

Third, officers and employees in or under the legislative branch of the Government—including the elected officers of Senate and House of Representatives, except the presiding officers of the two Houses;

Fourth, officers and employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration whose compensation is fixed under Public Law 293, Seventy-ninth Congress; and

Fifth, officers and employees whose compensation is provided by sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

The salary increases provided under the conference agreement will affect approximately 1,100,000 Federal employees and is retroactive to the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951.

The total cost of this legislation is \$418,346,430.

All salary increases provided are automatic, except in the case of employees in the offices of Senators. Senators may allocate the increased funds available in any manner they desire.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri who has shown much interest in this legislation.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Is this a 10-percent increase on the base salary or a 10-percent increase in the total compensation which they are now receiving?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It is a 10-percent increase on the amount they are presently receiving.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That includes any extras that have been given along the way.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell us how much the 10-percent increase above \$3,000 will amount to; that is, the bill that was passed by the House.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I would say in substance to the gentleman that the bill we have before us, as compared with the bill which passed the House is less expensive. I think to the extent of about \$30,000,000.

Mr. GROSS. Less than the across-the-board \$400 increase?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does this increase apply to the hundreds of thousands of temporary employees that have been put on the payroll?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It does.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I want to get it clear in my own mind as to where the limitations are on the \$300 and the

10 percent. Now it is my understanding that as to those who might be in our employ, for instance, as secretaries, the \$300 applies to those who are getting \$3,000 or under.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. And those that are getting 10 percent or a maximum of \$300 are in the \$3,000 class and above.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does that affect the base pay or the over-all?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That total amount that the employee receives. If the employee receives \$4,000, he will receive \$400 more than he presently receives annually.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am wondering did your committee consider how much of this increase is going to come back to the Government in taxes?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It gave some consideration to it, but I cannot, of course, give you any estimate of how much that will amount to. Of course, some of it will be returned in taxes, especially from those who are in the higher brackets.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Does this legislation deal with the subject of annual leave?

Mr. REES of Kansas. This legislation does not provide for annual leave. That is treated in another bill.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Is that coming up?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

I should add that the provision included in the Senate bill that created considerable discussion with respect to foreign service employees, by putting them under Civil Service as such, was stricken from the Senate bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that there are certain employees in the Veterans Bureau and elsewhere that are not covered by this bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No, I did not say that. They are included.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It covers all of them?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

(Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. MCCORMACK asked and was given permission to insert at this point in the RECORD the following statement and table:)

GENERAL PAY STATUTES INCREASING OR REDUCING BASE PAY RATES OF SALARIED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES OUTSIDE THE POSTAL SERVICE, 1908 TO JUNE 30, 1951

During the period from 1908 to July 1, 1924, when the Classification Act of 1923 became effective, there was no comparable Federal pay statute of general application. Consequently, there was no legislation providing for revision of existing salary schedules during this period comparable to subsequent revisions in Classification Act salary schedules. The only pay legislation during these years that was at all comparable to such revisions provided additional compensation, commonly referred to as "bonuses."

General pay legislation since 1908 providing salary increases or decreases for salaried employees outside the postal service (including statutes providing such so-called bonuses) and the administration in power at the time are shown by the following tabulation:

Statute and effective date of pertinent provisions	Increase or reduction provided	President on date of enactment
Act of Mar. 3, 1917, amended June 12, 1917, effective during fiscal year 1918.	10-percent increase for employees at salaries below \$1,200, and 5-percent increase for employees at salaries not less than \$1,200 and not more than \$1,800.	President Woodrow Wilson.
Act of July 3, 1918, effective during fiscal year 1919.....	In place of percentages added during fiscal year 1918. \$120 increase for employees at salaries of \$2,500 or less, and all salaries between \$2,500 and \$2,620 increased to \$2,620.	Do.
Acts of Mar. 1, 1919; May 29, 1920; Mar. 3, 1921; June 29, 1922; and Mar. 4, 1923. Effective during fiscal years 1920-24, inclusive.	In place of amounts granted during fiscal year 1919. \$240 increase for employees at salaries of \$2,500 or less, and all salaries between \$2,500 and \$2,740 increased to \$2,740.	Do.
Classification Act of Mar. 4, 1923, effective July 1, 1924.....	Increase in salaries was an incidental result of this act. Average increase per employee, \$67 or 4 percent, in the departmental service; field service data not available.	President Warren G. Harding.
Welch Act of May 28, 1928, effective July 1, 1928.....	Increased Classification Act salary rates. Average increase per employee, \$151 or 8.2 percent.	Do.
Brookhart Act of July 3, 1930, effective that date.....	Increased Classification Act maximum rates of some grades. Data on average increase not available.	President Calvin Coolidge.
Act of June 30, 1932, effective during fiscal year 1933.....	Employees with salaries in excess of \$1,000 a year furloughed without pay for 1 calendar month. Resulted in reduction of 8½ percent in annual pay.	President Herbert C. Hoover.
Act of Mar. 20, 1933, effective Apr. 1, 1933.....	Salaries reduced by the percentage of decrease in the cost of living as compared with the 6 months ending June 30, 1933, but not to exceed 15 percent. Resulted in reduction of 15 percent in annual salary rates.	Do.
Act of Mar. 28, 1934, effective Feb. 1, 1934.....	Limit on cost-of-living reduction changed from 15 to 10 percent during the portion of fiscal year 1934 beginning Feb. 1, 1934, and to 5 percent during fiscal year 1935. In place of prior 15-percent reduction, resulted in reduction of 10 percent in annual salary rates from Feb. 1, 1934, to July 1, 1934, and 5-percent reduction thereafter.	President Franklin D. Roosevelt.
Joint resolution of Feb. 13, 1935, effective Apr. 1, 1935.....	Eliminated cost-of-living reduction entirely.	Do.
Custodial Pay Act of Aug. 1, 1942, effective that date.....	Increased Classification Act rates for first 8 grades of crafts, protective, and custodial schedule and first 2 grades of subprofessional schedule. Among entire Classification Act group, average increase per employee, 1.1 percent.	Do.
Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, effective July 1, 1945...	Increased Classification Act and certain other statutory salary rates by 20 percent on the first \$1,200, 10 percent on next \$3,400, and 5 percent on remainder. Minimum rate of lowest grade increased 20 percent. Maximum rate of highest grade increased 8.9 percent. Average increase per employee, 15.9 percent.	President Harry S. Truman.
Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, effective July 1, 1946...	Increased Classification Act and certain other statutory salary rates by 14 percent or \$250 a year, whichever was greater, but not more than 25 percent. Minimum rate of lowest grade increased 25 percent. Maximum rate of highest grade increased 2.0 percent. Average increase per employee, 14.2 percent.	Do.
Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, effective first pay period beginning after June 30, 1948.	Increased Classification Act and certain other statutory salary rates by \$330 a year. Minimum rate of lowest grade increased 30.6 percent. Maximum rate of highest grade increased 3.3 percent. Average increase per employee, 11 percent.	Do.
Classification Act of 1949, effective first pay period beginning after Oct. 28, 1949.	Increase in Classification Act salary rates was an incidental result of this act. Minimum rate of lowest grade increased 7.1 percent. Maximum rate of grade 15 increased 6.5 percent. ¹ Average increase per employee, 4.1 percent.	Do.

¹ Grade GS-15 of the schedules of the Classification Act of 1949 is equivalent to the highest grade in which agencies or the Commission could classify positions prior to this act. The 1949 act established, in addition, grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, but limited the number of positions which might be placed in these new grades.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the conference report now before the House provides an increase of compensation to Federal employees of not less than \$300 for those having salaries of

\$3,000 or less, and 10 percent to those above that amount with a maximum not to exceed \$800.

For a long time it has been realized that some action should be taken by Congress to increase the pay of Federal employees so as to bring them in line with the ever increasing cost of living due to the inflationary conditions that now exist. Furthermore, we must realize that if the administration succeeds in its present plan to increase income taxes it will mean a serious condition to be

faced by Federal employees on the basis of present salaries.

It is right and just that Congress should give recognition to the need that exists in this matter. The delay in meeting this obligation is no longer justified. I will give my support to the conference report that provides this necessary increase.

I trust the conference report will have the approval of the House.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 317, nays 26, not voting 85, as follows:

[Roll No. 212]

YEAS—317

Abbott	Dingell	Keating
Abernethy	Dollinger	Kee
Adair	Dolliver	Kelly, N. Y.
Addonizio	Donohue	Kerr
Albert	Donovan	Kersten, Wis.
Allen, Ill.	Dorn	Kilday
Andersen,	Doughton	King
H. Carl	Doyle	Kirwan
Andresen,	Durham	Klein
August H.	Eberhart	Kluczynski
Anfuso	Elliott	Lane
Arends	Ellsworth	Lanham
Aspinall	Elston	Lantaff
Auchincloss	Evins	Larcade
Ayres	Fallon	LeCompte
Bailey	Feighan	Lesinski
Baker	Fenton	Lind
Bakewell	Fernandez	Lovre
Barden	Fisher	McCarthy
Barrett	Flood	McConnell
Bates, Mass.	Forand	McCormack
Battle	Ford	McCulloch
Beall	Forrester	McGregor
Beamer	Frazier	McGuire
Beckworth	Fugate	McKinnon
Belcher	Fulton	McMullen
Bender	Furcolo	Machrowicz
Bennett, Fla.	Gamble	Mack, Wash.
Bennett, Mich.	Garmatz	Madden
Bentsen	Gary	Magee
Berry	Gavin	Mahon
Betts	Goodwin	Mansfield
Bishop	Gordon	Marshall
Blatnik	Gore	Martin, Mass.
Boggs, Del.	Graham	Meador
Bolling	Granahan	Morrow
Bolton	Grant	Miller, Md.
Bonner	Green	Miller, N. Y.
Bow	Greenwood	Mills
Boykin	Gregory	Mitchell
Bray	Gwinn	Morano
Brehm	Hale	Morgan
Brown, Ga.	Hall	Morris
Brownson	Edwin Arthur	Morton
Bryson	Hall	Moulder
Buchanan	Leonard W.	Multer
Buckley	Hand	Mumma
Budge	Harden	Murdock
Burdick	Hardy	Murray, Tenn.
Burleson	Harris	Nicholson
Burnside	Harrison, Wyo.	Norblad
Burton	Hart	Norrell
Bush	Harvey	O'Brien, Ill.
Butler	Havener	O'Brien, Mich.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hays, Ohio	O'Hara
Byrnes, Wis.	Hedrick	O'Konski
Camp	Heffernan	O'Neill
Canfield	Heller	Ostertag
Cannon	Herter	O'Toole
Carlyle	Heseltun	Patman
Carnahan	Hill	Patten
Case	Hillings	Patterson
Celler	Hinshaw	Picklin
Chatham	Hoeven	Pickett
Chelf	Hoffman, Ill.	Poage
Chenoweth	Hollfield	Polk
Chiperfield	Holmes	Potter
Chudoff	Hope	Preston
Church	Horan	Price
Clemente	Howell	Prlest
Cole, Kans.	Hull	Rabaut
Colmer	Ikard	Radwan
Cooley	Jackson, Wash.	Rains
Cooper	James	Ramsay
Corbett	Jarman	Reams
Cotton	Javits	Reece, Tenn.
Coudert	Jenison	Reed, Ill.
Cox	Jenkins	Rees, Kans.
Crosser	Jonas	Rhodes
Crumpacker	Jones, Ala.	Riehlman
Cunningham	Jones, Mo.	Riley
Curtis, Mo.	Jones,	Rivers
Davis, Ga.	Hamilton C.	Roberts
Davis, Tenn.	Jones,	Robeson
Deane	Woodrow W.	Rodino
DeGraffenried	Judd	Rogers, Colo.
Denny	Karsten, Mo.	Rogers, Mass.
Denton	Kean	Rogers, Tex.
Devereux	Kearns	Rooney

Sadiak
St. George
Sasser
Saylor
Schwabe
Scott, Hardie
Scott,
Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Scudder
Secrest
Seely-Brown
Sheehan
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Sittler
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Spence
Springer

Staggers
Stanley
Steed
Stigler
Sutton
Tackett
Talle
Taylor
Teague
Thomas
Thompson,
Mich.
Thompson, Tex.
Tollefson
Trimble
Vail
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vorys
Walter

Welchel
Welch
Wharton
Whitaker
Widnall
Wier
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Withrow
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood, Idaho
Yates
Yorty

Mr. Granger with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Keiley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Reams.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Angeil.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. COLMER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

READJUSTMENT OF POSTAL RATES

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1046) to readjust postal rates, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TRIMBLE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 18, 1951.)

(Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, it is the purpose of this legislation to provide an adjustment in postal rates in order to increase revenue to the Post Office Department. Under the conference agreement there is no increase provided for first-class letter mail nor air mail. Government postal cards and private mailing cards will be increased to 2 cents with an additional 10 percent surcharge on the Government postal cards when they are purchased in quantities of 50 or more. Drop letters will be increased to 2 cents from the present rate of 1 cent.

The rates on second-class mail will remain the same within the county of publication. Outside the county of publication the present rates on second-class mail will receive a permanent increase of 30 percent applied in three annual increases of 10 percent each beginning April 1, 1952.

There will be no increase in the rates on publications maintained by and in the interest of nonprofit religious, education, scientific, philanthropic, veterans', labor, or fraternal organizations. Transient second-class mail is increased by 1 cent per piece.

The major increase in third-class bulk mail is an increase from the present rate of 1 cent to 1½ cents per piece. This increase will be effective July 1, 1952. There will also be an increase of ½ cent per piece on individual pieces of books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, etc., not mailed under the bulk mailing privilege. Other rates and fees in third-class mail remain unchanged. These other rates were increased January 1, 1949.

NAYS—26

Andrews	Jensen	Smith, Kans.
Buffett	Kilburn	Smith, Miss.
Clevenger	McVey	Stockman
Curtis, Nebr.	Mason	Taber
Gathings	Miller, Nebr.	Velde
George	Nelson	Vursell
Gross	Rankin	Wheeler
Hallock	Reed, N. Y.	Whitten
Hoffman, Mich.	Shafer	

NOT VOTING—85

Aandahl	Golden	Perkins
Allen, Calif.	Granger	Phillips
Allen, La.	Hagen	Poulson
Anderson, Calif.	Harrison, Va.	Powell
Angell	Hays, Ark.	Prouty
Armstrong	Hébert	Quinn
Baring	Herlong	Redden
Bates, Ky.	Hess	Regan
Blackney	Hunter	Ribicoff
Boggs, La.	Irving	Richards
Bosone	Jackson, Calif.	Rogers, Fla.
Bramblett	Johnson	Roosevelt
Brooks	Kearney	Sabath
Brown, Ohio	Kelley, Pa.	Shelley
Busbey	Kennedy	Sheppard
Cole, N. Y.	Keogh	Short
Combs	Latham	Sieminski
Crawford	Lucas	Sikes
Dague	Lyle	Thornberry
Davis, Wis.	McDonough	Vinson
Dawson	McGrath	Watts
Delaney	McMillan	Wardel
Dempsey	Mack, Ill.	Wickersham
D'Ewart	Martin, Iowa	Willson, Tex.
Dondero	Miller, Calif.	Wood, Ga.
Eaton	Morrison	Woodruff
Engle	Murphy	Zablocki
Fine	Murray, Wis.	
Fogarty	Passman	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Allen of California.	Mr. Baring with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Armstrong.	Mr. Shelley with Mr. Bramblett.
Mr. Rogers of Florida with Mr. Kearney.	Mr. McGrath with Mr. Hunter.
Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Latham.	Mr. Sikes with Mr. D'Ewart.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Hagen.	Mr. Regan with Mr. Prouty.
Mr. Engle with Mr. Dondero.	Mr. Redden with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Fine with Mr. Eaton.	
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.	
Mr. Quinn with Mr. Phillips.	
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Short.	
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Wardel.	
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Anderson of California.	
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Aandahl.	
Mr. Watts with Mr. Blackney.	
Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Johnson.	
Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Hess.	
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Goiden.	
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Cole of New York.	
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Busbey.	
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. McDonough.	
Mr. Passman with Mr. Martin of Iowa.	
Mr. Perkins with Mr. Poulson.	
Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Woodruff.	
Mr. Sieminski with Mr. Jackson of California.	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, is my understanding correct that this is a conference report, unanimously agreed upon, on the bill raising the salaries of postal officials and employees?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator intend to follow this conference report with another, dealing with all Federal employees?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is the plan.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection to the consideration of the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senate in the beginning that the conference-report bill, so far as the money it will require is concerned, will not vary more than \$5,000,000 from the bill as passed by the Senate. It will cost about \$252,000,000 to pay the increases in salary to all the postal workers, and also to reclassify the salaries of postmasters and supervisors. We have two bills in one, as Senators will remember. This bill would also pay a flat increase of \$400 to all postal employees, and an increase of 20 cents an hour for hourly employees, in addition to the elimination of the two lowest automatic grades.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Are the provisions of the conference report printed? Is it available for distribution?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The provisions are as they were in the bill which the Senate passed, practically without change. The conference report is practically the Senate bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then the conference report, generally speaking, with minor exceptions, is the Senate bill which we passed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is the Senate bill with one exception. We agreed to the House provision for a flat increase of \$400, instead of going to 8.8 percent for the employees other than postmasters and supervisors. This affected only about 150 employees. The difference between the conference committee bill and the Senate bill is perhaps \$5,000 or \$10,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. What is the estimated annual cost?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The estimated annual cost of the increased pay for postal employees, and also the adjustment of salaries of postmasters and supervisors, is \$252,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Have the conferees agreed on the bill raising postal rates?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They have agreed. The conference re-

port is now on the desk. The House has already approved it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Can the Senator indicate how much money is to be raised through increased postal rates, under the conference report?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Taking into consideration the Interstate Commerce Commission ruling, it will be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$235,000,000 or \$236,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. The net result is that the postal rate increase bill does not raise quite enough money to take care of the salary increases, and we have made no progress whatever toward eliminating the postal deficit.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true. That is because of the treatment of certain provisions of the postal rate bill, especially those with respect to first-class mail. The House refused to go along with any increase. That reduced the amount under the Senate bill by approximately \$217,000,000. I was not pleased with that, but it was the best we could get out of the conference.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know that the distinguished Senator and other representatives of the Senate vigorously represented the views of the Senate in the conference. But as one who voted for increased rates, I express my disappointment that our efforts have resulted only in taking care of the pay increases for postal employees. We have been unable to apply any substantial sum to the half billion dollar annual postal deficit. That must come out of the taxpayers of the United States generally.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am sure that I speak for all the Senate conferees when I say that they felt the same way. We labored and tried to do everything we could, with the two bills which were before us, to bring about an increase in revenue, but we could not do it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the Senator and his committee will consider the matter afresh next year, to see if some steps cannot be taken toward eliminating some of the deficit.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am glad the Senator from Georgia brought out that point. We are not discussing the other bill at this time, except to the extent of letting the Senator know what happened. In the conference we adopted what was known as the Carlson resolution or proposal, to look into the matter thoroughly and see where we could raise more revenue, and thus do justice to the taxpayers. The joint committee of the House and Senate will work on the problem. The great trouble has been that the House would go off into one field and the Senate into another, and they would not meet when bills came before the conferees.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am delighted that that much progress has been made in the adoption of the Carlson proposal. I hope it will lead to measures which will enable us to make the Post Office Department self-sustaining. To me, that is something that is pressing upon us in this day of deficits. When we have a

monopoly in the transportation of mail, we ought to be able to make it pay its own way.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. May I ask the distinguished Senator what the arguments were with respect to the so-called Long amendment regarding magazines carrying advertising?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That bill is not now under consideration.

Mr. McFARLAND. The reason I ask the question is that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] asked about that bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We made another minor amendment which we thought would save a little money. In the Senate bill, we increased the equipment allowance for rural carriers from 8 to 9 cents a mile or a minimum of \$3 per day, regardless of how much that mileage might be. That was amended so as to provide an increase in the equipment allowance for rural carriers from 8 to 9 cents a mile, with authority to the Postmaster General to make the equipment allowance to rural carriers on heavy-duty routes, not to exceed \$3 a day in lieu of the 9 cents, which is in effect practically the same thing as the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], except that it leaves to the discretion of the Postmaster General as to what is a heavy-duty route and the exact amount to be allowed in lieu of 9 cents, but with a ceiling of \$3. If, however, the mileage is such that 9 cents a mile is more than \$3, then the 9 cents a mile is mandatory.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is this the amendment which I offered with respect to rural delivery?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was out of the Chamber when the Senator was explaining it. Will he please tell me again what was done?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The equipment allowance for rural carriers was increased from 8 to 9 cents a mile, with authority to the Postmaster General to make an allowance for use of equipment to carriers on heavy-duty routes, not to exceed \$3 a day, in lieu of the 9 cents, which is in effect practically the same thing as the Senator's amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It provides more flexibility for the heavy-duty routes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from Minnesota will remember that the figure in his amendment was \$3.50.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. That was reduced to \$3 on the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. This provision would still give the Postmaster General the right to leave the allowance at \$3, if he so desires.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution, for which I ask immediate consideration. The purpose of the concurrent resolution is to correct a typographical error which crept into the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be stated.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 52) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 355) to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, to make the following correction, namely: In the language contained in the conference report on page 2, table of grades and salaries of employees in the automatic grades, under "Examiners of Equipment and Supplies," strike out "4,470" and insert in lieu thereof "5,470."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, it is necessary to correct the typographical error. It affects the classifications.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4473) to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5684) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. GARY, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. CANNON, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. COUDERT, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

- S. 57. An act for the relief of Ertogroul Osman and Mehmed Fahreddin;
- S. 118. An act for the relief of Nouhad Ann Khoury;
- S. 519. An act for the relief of Moy Chin Shee;
- S. 575. An act for the relief of Robert Jose Toribio;
- S. 582. An act for the relief of Emma Burr;
- S. 635. An act for the relief of Hans Lenk;
- S. 775. An act for the relief of Dr. Anthony M. Opisso;
- S. 829. An act for the relief of Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roseileen Schut;
- S. 921. An act to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947;
- S. 954. An act for the relief of Dr. Charles Gordon Rennick Sell;
- S. 1048. An act for the relief of Myrtle Harding;
- S. 1274. An act for the relief of Vera Gumancoff;
- S. 1436. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller;
- S. 1622. An act to amend section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946;
- S. 1640. An act for the relief of Cathy Dana Besser;
- S. 1912. An act to provide for conveyance of certain land to the city of New Orleans;
- S. 1952. An act to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes;
- S. 1970. An act for the relief of Louis E. Gabel;
- S. 2007. An act for the relief of Sharon A. Gates;
- S. 2027. An act for the relief of Leo Kieve; and
- H. R. 4473. An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Roger M. Foley, of East Milton, Mass., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Massachusetts, to fill an existing vacancy, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joseph Charles Duggan, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Abraham J. Harris, resigned.

INCREASE OF COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes. I ask

unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see pp. 13801, 13802 of House proceedings, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 18, 1951.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I would appreciate it if the Senator from Rhode Island would give the Senate a brief explanation of the report. I should also like to ask him this question: Was the report of the conferees unanimous?

Mr. PASTORE. The senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] did not sign the report.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask one further question. Is the senior Senator from North Dakota interested in being present when the report is considered?

Mr. PASTORE. The senior Senator from North Dakota was in the Chamber not more than 2 minutes ago.

Mr. President, the House bill provided for a flat \$400 increase for employees under the classified service of the Federal Government. The Senate bill provided a 10-percent increase for these same employees, with a maximum ceiling of \$800. The conference agreement provides a \$300 floor and an \$800 ceiling, with a 10-percent increase.

The compromise agreement will cost \$37,000,000 more than the Senate version and \$25,000,000 less than the House version. Employees covered under the provisions of the conference agreement number approximately 1,150,000. Such employees include employees under the Classification Act of 1949, employees in the judicial branch under the Classification Act, secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges, employees of the legislative branch, Foreign Service officers of the State Department, and officers and employees of the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration.

The conference agreement is retroactive to July 1, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief statement. I was a member of the conference committee, and I am the only member who did not sign the report. The reason I did not sign the report was not because I was not in favor of a \$300 raise, but because to my mind it seemed that the amount of \$300 was far too low to give to these Federal employees, some of whom have worked for the Government for 25 years or more. Now we come along with a little, miserable \$300 increase.

I remember very well, Mr. President, when the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], spoke at the annual convention in Los Angeles. I

remember the newspaper headline. I do not know whether he saw it. Across the top of the newspaper, in very large type, it told about the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] coming home to fight for a real salary increase, mentioning \$500 and \$600. It was stated that at last the Federal employees had a chairman who was going to the people who had worked and slaved for the Government would get a real increase. It was a remarkable speech. In fact, I complimented the Senator from South Carolina on the magnificent political speech he had made in favor of an increase to these employees.

Now he comes back and he settles for a miserable \$300. The postal workers got \$400. The postal employees are organized. They have men like Bill Doherty and Jerome Keating, who work for them. They are real organizers. They have gotten practically 100 per cent cooperation. The other Federal workers wander around aimlessly and get lost in the shuffle. The result is that they do not get \$400, but only \$300.

It is stated that the raise was made \$300 in order to save a little money. I believe about \$30,000,000 a year would be saved. On the same day that the salary-increase bill was passed the Senate passed a bill which gave \$7,157,000,000 to foreign countries.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. Is the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota aware of the fact that one of the recipients of the \$7,157,000,000 was Belgium, which retired their King Leopold to the back pasture on \$125,000 of our money a year?

Mr. LANGER. No; I did not know that. I do not believe that a king could get along on \$125,000 of American money. I suppose he could make a stab at it. Some of the Federal workers who have been given a \$300 raise are driving taxi cabs at night, their wives are out scrubbing floors, and their daughters, when they get to be 12 or 13 years of age, get jobs as baby sitters. The families of the workers cannot educate their children properly.

When an investigation was made about 2 years ago it was found that at the end of 20 years service for the Government a man could not even send one of his children to college. When the husband or wife falls sick and must go to the hospital, the family is in debt for years and years.

I like all my colleagues on the conference committee, but I wish to call attention to the fact that the House conferees voted 4 to 1 for a raise clear across the board. It may be that the House conferees are closer to the rank and file of our people, and know the kind of struggle they are having in meeting the highest cost of living in all the history of the United States of America.

So I wish to say that while I am not going to oppose adoption of the conference report, and I hope it will be adopted, yet I would be ashamed of myself, and I could not look at myself in the looking glass, if I were to vote for a miserable \$300 increase in pay. That is why I refused to sign the conference report.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to one of the features of the conference report which I think is most important and requires the serious consideration of the Senate.

After action is taken on this conference report, I expect to call up and request immediate consideration for House bill 5329. I make that statement for the reason that by means of the Kilgore amendment, which was made on the floor of the Senate, we included in the benefits of Senate bill 622 the Metropolitan police, firemen, and school teachers of the District of Columbia. The conference committee did not agree to the retention of that amendment in the conference report. For that reason, the conferees on the part of the Senate receded from their position, and accepted the House version of the bill, which means that now the Metropolitan police, firemen, and school teachers of the District of Columbia are not included in the benefits provided by Senate bill 622.

However, it was generally felt by the members of the committee of conference that the House bill 5329 should be amended by including in it a provision for benefits similar to those which are being given to Federal Government employees under Senate bill 622.

Therefore, Mr. President, I now give notice that immediately after action is taken on the conference report, I shall ask unanimous consent for the consideration of House bill 5329, which already has been reported favorably by the committee, with an amendment. That bill is for the purpose of extending the same benefits to the Metropolitan police, firemen, and school teachers of the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I now move the adoption of the conference report on Senate bill 622.

The report was agreed to.

INCREASE IN SALARIES OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE, MEMBERS OF THE FIRE DEPARTMENT, AND EMPLOYEES OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 5329.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5329), Calendar No. 977, to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I wish to assure the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island that I am not going to object, let me say that, as a matter of fact, I wish to commend the Senator from Rhode Island for bringing up this bill at this time. It had been my hope, too, that these employees might be included in the pay legislation which was

considered by our committee. In all fairness to the policemen, firemen, teachers, and other employees of the District of Columbia, I sincerely trust that they will be taken care of pursuant to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island for the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Rhode Island, if he will yield to me for a question.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the pay increase the policemen and school teachers will receive also be in the amount of a minimum of \$300?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island believe that is enough?

Mr. PASTORE. I only say that at least it is consistent.

Mr. LANGER. Consistent with what, Mr. President?

Mr. PASTORE. Consistent with the bill we passed a moment ago.

Mr. LANGER. It is not consistent with the \$400 pay increase received by the postal employees, is it?

Mr. PASTORE. The situation is somewhat different. We have gone over that matter time and time again; all of it has been explained.

The fact is that if we consider the proportionate increase for those in the lowest pay scale in the classified service and for those in the lowest pay scale in the postal service, we find that the \$300, as compared with the \$400, is a very reasonable compromise.

My heart bleeds just as much as does that of the Senator from North Dakota for these workers.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let me ask if it is true that the cost of living affects a poor man just as much as it does a man who receives a salary of \$12,000. A poor man has a grocery bill which is just as high; his bills for rent and the price he must pay for potatoes and beefsteak are just as large as those of the higher salaried employees, even though the former receives a salary of only \$3,000 or \$3,500, or in some instances only \$2,500. Is not that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, let me ask how much beefsteak can be purchased by a man who receives a salary of \$3,500.

Mr. LANGER. That is exactly the point. Similarly, how much rent can be paid by a man who has a salary of \$3,200 or \$3,300 or \$3,500 a year?

At this time a proposal is made to increase their pay by \$300, at a minimum, on the basis of a pay increase of 10 per cent, with a maximum increase of \$800 for those in the higher salary brackets.

I submit that the poor man is not getting a square deal by means of this measure. I submit that this bill should call for an increase of \$400 straight across the board, if the purpose of the bill is to provide for meeting the increase in the cost of living.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5329) to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That (a) the annual compensation (including basic salary and additional compensation in lieu of overtime pay and night pay differential) of each officer and member of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, as increased by the act entitled "An act to provide for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to conform with the increased cost of living in the District of Columbia," approved July 14, 1945, as amended and by the act entitled "An act to increase the compensation of certain employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1949, shall be further increased by 10 percent, (plus 8 percent of such 10 percent as additional compensation in lieu of overtime pay and night pay differential) except that in no case shall such compensation be increased by less than \$300 per annum or by more than \$800 per annum. The proviso contained in the first sentence of the first section of said Act of June 30, 1949, is hereby repealed; but no officer or members covered by this section shall, by reason of the enactment of this section, be paid with respect to any pay period, basic salary, or basic salary plus additional compensation at a rate in excess of \$11,130 per annum.

(b) (1) Each employee of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia whose salary is fixed and regulated by the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, except the Superintendent of Schools, shall receive, in addition to the compensation already provided by such act and by the Act of June 30, 1949, compensation at the rate of 10 percent of the aggregate compensation provided by such acts, except that in no case shall the additional compensation provided for in this paragraph be increased by less than \$300 per annum or by more than \$800 per annum.

(2) The basic and maximum salaries for all salary classes in Title I of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, except class 29, are hereby increased by 10 percent, except that in no case shall any such basic or maximum salary be increased by less than \$300 per annum or by more than \$800 per annum.

(c) In the exercise of the authority granted by section 81 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, as amended, the Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized and directed to grant additional compensation to policemen, firemen, and school teachers employed by the Canal Zone Government, whenever additional compensation is granted to employees of the District of Columbia employed in similar or comparable positions. The additional compensation for such Canal Zone employees shall be effective as of the date any additional compensation is granted to similar or comparable employees of the District of Columbia.

Sec. 2. Authority is hereby granted to the Commissioners and to other wage-fixing au-

thorities of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, the Secretary of the Interior and the President of the United States, in their discretion, to grant additional compensation at rates not to exceed those prevailing without regard to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), additional compensation at rates not to exceed those prevailing in the District of Columbia for similar or comparable employment to each employee in or under the municipal government of the District of Columbia, National Capital Parks and the Executive Mansion Grounds, whose compensation is fixed and adjusted from time to time by a wage board, or whose compensation is fixed without reference to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or whose compensation is limited or fixed specifically by the provisions of the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1952.

Sec. 3. This act, except section 2 hereof, shall become effective as of the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to; and, without objection, the amendment will be engrossed, and the bill will be read the third time, and passed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, before that action is taken, I wish to offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair begs the pardon of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment; and to that amendment the Senator from Rhode Island submits an amendment, which will be stated.

The Chief Clerk. In the committee amendment, on page 7, in line 1, after the word "Act", it is proposed to strike out "except section 2 hereof".

On page 7, line 1, after the numeral "(3)", it is proposed to insert the letter "(a)".

On page 7, it is proposed to insert a new subsection (b) to section 3, as follows:

(b) No retroactive compensation or salary shall be payable by reason of the enactment of this act in the case of any individual not in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid a retired officer or employee for services rendered during the period beginning with the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951, and ending with the date of his retirement.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island explain the amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. PASTORE. This amendment to the committee amendment is to take care of those who have left the service after July 1, 1951. The purpose is to give them retroactive pay only for the length of time they were actually employed after that date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, to the committee amendment as amended, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator's amendment offered to the committee amendment?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The Chief Clerk. In the committee amendment on page 7, before line 1, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

Sec. 3. (a) Public Law 159, Eighty-second Congress, is hereby amended by striking out section 3 thereof.

(b) This section shall be effective October 8, 1951.

On page 7, line 1, it is proposed to strike out "Sec. 3." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 4."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment to the committee amendment is to correct the mistake which we permitted to go in, in connection with another bill which gave employees a retroactive feature in regard to their retirement. That is something we have never done before, and the purpose of this amendment to the committee amendment is to correct that error, which went through.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there further amendments to be proposed to the committee amendment?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

READJUSTMENT OF POSTAL RATES— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1046) to readjust postal rates. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see pp. 13795-13798, House proceedings of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 18, 1951.)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, as agreed upon by the

Public Law 201 - 82d Congress
Chapter 554 - 1st Session
S. 622

AN ACT

All 65 Stat. 612.

To increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 603 (b) and section 603 (c) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

Classification Act of 1949, amendments.
63 Stat. 965.
5 U.S.C. § 1113.
GS compensation schedule.

"(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates						
GS-1.....	\$2,500	\$2,580	\$2,660	\$2,740	\$2,820	\$2,900	\$2,980
GS-2.....	2,750	2,830	2,910	2,990	3,070	3,150	3,230
GS-3.....	2,950	3,030	3,110	3,190	3,270	3,350	3,430
GS-4.....	3,175	3,255	3,335	3,415	3,495	3,575	3,655
GS-5.....	3,410	3,535	3,660	3,785	3,910	4,035	4,160
GS-6.....	3,795	3,920	4,045	4,170	4,295	4,420	4,545
GS-7.....	4,205	4,330	4,455	4,580	4,705	4,830	4,955
GS-8.....	4,620	4,745	4,870	4,995	5,120	5,245	5,370
GS-9.....	5,060	5,185	5,310	5,435	5,560	5,685	5,810
GS-10.....	5,500	5,625	5,750	5,875	6,000	6,125	6,250
GS-11.....	5,940	6,140	6,340	6,540	6,740	6,940	
GS-12.....	7,040	7,240	7,440	7,640	7,840	8,040	
GS-13.....	8,360	8,560	8,760	8,960	9,160	9,360	
GS-14.....	9,600	9,800	10,000	10,200	10,400	10,600	
GS-15.....	10,800	11,050	11,300	11,550	11,800		
GS-16.....	12,000	12,200	12,400	12,600	12,800		
GS-17.....	13,000	13,200	13,400	13,600	13,800		
GS-18.....	14,800						

"(c) (1) The compensation schedule for the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule shall be as follows:

CPC compensation schedule.

"Grade	Per annum rates						
CPC-1.....	\$1,810	\$1,870	\$1,930	\$1,990	\$2,050	\$2,110	\$2,170
CPC-2.....	2,420	2,490	2,560	2,630	2,700	2,770	2,840
CPC-3.....	2,552	2,632	2,712	2,792	2,872	2,952	3,032
CPC-4.....	2,750	2,830	2,910	2,990	3,070	3,150	3,230
CPC-5.....	2,974	3,054	3,134	3,214	3,294	3,374	3,454
CPC-6.....	3,200	3,280	3,360	3,440	3,520	3,600	3,680
CPC-7.....	3,435	3,535	3,635	3,735	3,835	3,935	4,035
CPC-8.....	3,740	3,865	3,990	4,115	4,240	4,365	4,490
CPC-9.....	4,150	4,275	4,400	4,525	4,650	4,775	4,900
CPC-10.....	4,565	4,690	4,815	4,940	5,065	5,190	5,315

"(2) Charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of \$2,700 per annum, and head charwomen working part time at the rate of \$2,840 per annum."

Charwomen.

(b) In adjusting initially the rates of pay of employees affected by the provisions of this section—

Rate adjustments.

(1) an employee receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this Act at one of the scheduled or longevity rates provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this Act at the corresponding scheduled or longevity rate as increased by this Act; and

63 Stat. 954.
5 U.S.C. § 1071 note.

(2) an employee receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this Act at a rate other than a scheduled or longevity rate provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this Act as follows:

(A) If his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this Act was less than the maximum longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at the scheduled or longevity rate which he would receive under paragraph (1) had he been receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date at the scheduled or longevity rate next higher than his rate of basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date.

All 65 Stat. 613.

(B) If his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this Act was in excess of the maximum longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately prior to such date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this Act in such maximum longevity rate.

(C) If he is a part-time char employee and his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this Act was in excess of the rate provided for his position under section 603 (c) (2) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately prior to such effective date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this Act in the rate for like positions under such section.

5 U.S.C. § 1113.

Judicial branch.

60 Stat. 329.

62 Stat. 843,
913, 918, 923.

Secretaries,
etc., of cir-
cuit and dis-
trict judges.

64 Stat. 631.

5 U.S.C. § 1121.

(c) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed pursuant to section 62 (2) of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C. 102 (a) (2)), section 3656 of title 18 of the United States Code, the second and third sentences of section 603, section 604 (5), or sections 672 to 675, inclusive, of title 28 of the United States Code, or who are appointed pursuant to section 792 (b) of title 28 of the United States Code, are hereby increased by amounts equal to the increases provided by subsections (a) and (b) in corresponding rates of compensation paid to officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949.

(d) The limitations of \$9,600 and \$13,050 with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges, contained in the sixteenth paragraph under the head "Miscellaneous salaries" in the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 759, Eighty-first Congress), or in any subsequent appropriation Act, shall be increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this Act.

(e) Section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 701." and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Any increase in compensation granted by law after June 30, 1951, shall not be construed to be an equivalent increase in compensation within the meaning of subsection (a)."

Legislative
branch.

60 Stat. 217.

5 U.S.C.

§§ 931, 932.

59 Stat. 301.

5 U.S.C.

§§ 931, 932.

62 Stat. 1267.

5 U.S.C. § 955.

63 Stat. 974.

2 U.S.C. §§ 60f

and note, 60a

note; 5 U.S.C.

§ 932a note.

SEC. 2. (a) Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government (other than an employee in the office of a Senator) whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 10 per centum of the aggregate rate of his basic compensation and the rate of the additional compensation received by him under sections 501 and 502 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, section 301 of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and the provisions under the heading "Increased pay for legislative employees" in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, except that (1) no such officer or employee shall be paid additional compensation at a rate less than \$300 per annum or in excess of \$800 per annum, and (2) employees paid on an hourly or part-time basis shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 20 cents per hour.

(b) The provisions of section 603 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, section 7 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, as amended, section 303 (c) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and the provisions of paragraph (b) under the heading "Increased pay for legislative employees" in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, shall not apply

5 U.S.C. §§ 943,

943a, 957.

5 U.S.C. § 932a.

to officers or employees subject to the provisions of subsection (a) or to employees in the offices of Senators, but no such officer or employee, or any other officer or employee of the Senate or House of Representatives, shall be paid with respect to any pay period basic compensation or basic compensation plus additional compensation at a rate in excess of \$11,646 per annum unless expressly authorized by law.

(c) (1) The aggregate amount of the basic compensation authorized to be paid for administrative and clerical assistance and messenger service in the offices of Senators is hereby increased by—

Offices of
Senators.
Administrative,
etc., assist-
ance.

(A) \$4,140 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is less than three million;

(B) \$4,860 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is three million or more but less than five million;

(C) \$5,220 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is five million or more but less than ten million; and

(D) \$5,760 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is ten million or more.

(2) The second proviso in the paragraph relating to the authority of Senators to rearrange the basic salaries of employees in their respective offices, which appears in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, as amended (2 U. S. C. 60f), is amended by striking out "\$5,280" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$5,880"; and by striking out "\$6,720" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$7,320".

63 Stat. 974.

(3) Notwithstanding the third proviso in such paragraph any increase in the compensation of an employee in a Senator's office shall take effect on the effective date of this Act or on the date such employee became employed, whichever is later, if (A) the certification filed by such Senator under such proviso so provides, (B) such certification is filed in the disbursing office of the Senate not later than November 30, 1951, and (C) the amount of such increase does not exceed the amount of the increase which would be payable in the case of such employee if he were subject to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

(d) The provisions of subsection (a), and the provisions of law referred to in such subsection, shall not apply to employees whose compensation is paid from the appropriation contained in the paragraph designated "Folding documents" under the heading "Contingent expenses of the Senate" in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act.

(e) The rates of basic compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives (not including the presiding officers of the two Houses), the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, the legislative counsel of the Senate, the legislative counsel of the House of Representatives, and the Coordinator of Information of the House of Representatives are hereby increased by 10 per centum, except that in no case shall any such rate be increased by less than \$300 per annum or by more than \$800 per annum.

Congress.
Elected officers.

SEC. 3. Section 66 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 269) is hereby amended to read as follows:

12 U.S.C. § 1138f.

"SEC. 66. No director, officer, or employee of the Central Bank for Cooperatives, or of any production credit corporation, production credit association, or bank for cooperatives shall be paid compensation at a rate in excess of \$13,800 per annum."

Central Bank for
Cooperatives.

SEC. 4. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration whose rates of basic compensation are provided by Public Law 293, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved January 3, 1946, as amended, are hereby increased by 10 per centum, except that in no

Veterans' Admin-
istration.
Department of
Medicine and
Surgery.
59 Stat. 675.
38 U.S.C. §§ 15-
15n.

38 U.S.C. § 15g.

60 Stat. 1003.
22 U.S.C.
§§ 867, 870.

Report to Con-
gressional com-
mittees.

Effective date.

Retroactive com-
pensation.

case shall any such rate be increased by less than \$300 per annum or by more than \$800 per annum.

(b) Section 8 (d) of Public Law 293, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out "\$12,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,800".

SEC. 5. (a) The rates of basic compensation provided by sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, are hereby increased by 10 per centum, except that in no case shall any such rate be increased by less than \$300 per annum, or by more than \$800 per annum.

(b) The Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission are authorized and directed to transmit to the Post Office and Civil Service Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives on or before April 1, 1952, a report on pay and personnel practices being followed in overseas areas by all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, including the Foreign Service of the State Department.

SEC. 6. (a) This Act shall become effective as of the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951.

(b) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid under this Act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid a retired officer or employee for services rendered during the period beginning with the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951, and ending with the date of his retirement.

Approved October 24, 1951.